Executive Summary

SafeFutures is a national initiative sponsored by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) of the US Department of Justice to create program models of integrated local approaches to juvenile delinquency prevention and intervention. Under this initiative, OJJDP provided approximately $1.4 million a year for five years to each of six communities, including Contra Costa County.

Contra Costa County SafeFutures program components include:

1. *Mentoring*: Three Mentoring Programs for at-risk youth;

2. *Family/Schools/Community Partnership (F/S/C)*: Initially, this program operated at six schools—three elementary schools, one middle school and two high schools. As the program evolved, staff at the middle and high schools were drawn into the Core Team program, leaving F/S/C as essentially an elementary school early intervention program.

3. *Orin Allen Youth Rehabilitation Facility Aftercare (Ranch Aftercare)*: Intensive supervision and services for 45 days following release from the Boys Ranch to the community;

4. *Summit Center*: A residential/ day treatment center for male juvenile offenders with serious emotional difficulties); and

5. *The Gang Prevention Program (Core Team)*: An array of programs providing interagency case management and service coordination for gang-involved youth residing in West County.

Findings:

Juvenile Justice Recidivism: SafeFutures participants were compared to a cohort of youth matched on age, ethnicity, gender, and number of juvenile probation referrals in the year prior to the intervention. Although we were not able to assess the Family/Schools/Community Partnership (because it served a younger client population with few offenders), each of the other programs showed a reduction in recidivism in the six months after program entry. Even more encouraging, these gains were sustained through a twelve-month follow-up period (from 7-18 months after intake). Results were most positive for the Summit Center and Aftercare Programs. When compared to the comparison group, these reductions in recidivism were statistically significant for the Ranch Aftercare Program for intake-six month period, and were statistically significant for Mentoring, Aftercare, and Summit Center for the twelve-month follow-up period. *The combination of large effect size, sustained positive outcome, and statistical significance of the results suggest that SafeFutures has certainly been successful in addressing its primary goal of reducing juvenile offending.*

Educational Outcomes: For those SafeFutures participants who were enrolled in the West Contra Costa Unified School District, the evaluation was able to conduct a limited assessment of educational outcomes. Due to a variety of limitations in the extent and the quality of data, we were not able to construct an adequate comparison group. However, we were able to track educational histories for 245 participants for the school year proceeding SafeFutures enrollment, the school year of SafeFutures enrollment, and the

school year subsequent to SafeFutures enrollment. For this group, we found that Ranch Aftercare participants manifested large decreases in total days of school missed, unexcused absences, and number of days suspended. This effect was observed in the year in which aftercare services were received, and was sustained into the next year. Although data inadequacies and inability to construct a comparison group limit our confidence in these results, a Z-test of significance for the changes between the observation periods was at a statistically significant level for all but one observation of each variable. Mentoring, Family/School/Community, and Core Team Programs did not demonstrate similar changes in any dimension of attendance.[1] Summit Center was not evaluated on this dimension due to an *n* that was too low to produce meaningful results.

We assessed the performance of participants on the state-mandated STAR tests. We found no statistically significant differences between the observation periods for any of the SafeFutures components. Summit Center was not evaluated on this dimension due to an *n* that was too low to produce meaningful results.

Collaboration: The SafeFutures Initiative included a number of efforts to build interagency and multidisciplinary partnerships in serving youth. Some of these partnerships have been extremely successful—most notably the Probation-Mental Health partnership, which will clearly endure and continue to benefit children for the foreseeable future. Several other collaborations are very promising. These include the Core Team collaboration around gang-involved youth, and the newly-formed Mental Health/Youth Service Bureau collaboration to serve emotionally disturbed youth in West County. It is the evaluators' hope that the Mental Health/Youth Service Bureau collaboration will succeed and be a model for many similar County-community partnerships in the future. On the negative end of the spectrum, the Gang Task Force must be accounted an ultimate failure, and an intended collaboration between the County, non-profits, and the West Contra Costa Unified School District was stillborn. *On balance, the development of successful collaborations must be accounted a major success of this initiative.* SafeFutures entered an arena in West County that has been characterized by relatively weak, underfunded, and mutually-suspicious institutions (both public and private). Even in cases where the formal collaboration has not been successful, SafeFutures has left behind a greater level of trust and mutual understanding than existed before. This achievement was due primarily to the great patience and consistent strategic direction of the SafeFutures administration, often in the face of great pessimism among the collaborative partners and within the County administration itself.

Recommendations:

1. The Ranch Aftercare, Summit Center, and Mentoring Components are highly effective in reducing reoffending by participating youth and clearly warrant permanent incorporation into the County's continuum of care. In fact, we would urge the County to undertake a planning process to ensure that these programs are taken to scale throughout the county, so that they are accessible to all youth whose level of

---

[1] In fact, the Family/School/Community Program manifested a statistically significant change in a negative direction for several observations. We do not attribute this, however, to the effects of the program, but to the fact that so many of its participants were in the early middle school period when absenteeism tends to increase.

risk warrants these interventions. This should be done, in our view, even if this requires the transfer of resources from other, less effective, programs.

2. Even with limitations in the data, the Ranch Aftercare Program demonstrated that a strong programmatic commitment to school attendance can have a significant impact on student absenteeism. We would recommend that this commitment be extended, to the maximum feasible extent, throughout Juvenile Probation and perhaps into other programs that provide intensive case management for high-risk youth.

3. The Core Team appears to be a promising program, but it has suffered from lack of adequate organization in the areas of client identification, triage, and follow-up. We would recommend the continuation of the Core Team within the context of a more comprehensive case management system for high-risk youth. If this effort is to succeed, it will require an institution that will devote time and effort to organizing, supporting, and staffing the partnership. The Contra Costa County Probation Department has both the resources and the legitimacy to undertake this central role, and we would recommend that they seriously consider doing so.

4. We were not able to evaluate outcomes for the Family/Schools/Community Partnership due to a variety of data issues. There were significant problems with this program, both in its design and in its implementation. Originally, it was intended to be an afterschool program on the Beacon School model; however, funding limitations led to its becoming more of a school counseling program. As such, our key informant interviews and focus groups found a great deal of support for the program within the school settings in which it operated. We also were impressed with the commitment and quality of the line staff. However, participants entered the program through a haphazard referral process, and often received inadequate assessment and care planning. As a result, it appears that many of the participants actually required more sustained and comprehensive services than were (or could be) provided by this program.

    Quantitative data analysis, key informant interviews, and community focus groups all point to great need and potential benefit to providing a continuum of counseling and other early intervention programs in the West Contra Costa County schools. Additionally, our analyses suggest that there are several sources of revenue that could be tapped to support these programs. Developing an effective program, however, would require substantial planning and oversight involving the County, the West Contra Costa Unified School District, and non-profit providers. Unless all three stakeholders can make a serious institutional commitment to develop such a program, it is unlikely to be successful.

5. There are a variety of blended funding efforts already underway within the County. However, our analyses indicate that there remains a considerable potential for further tapping Federal and state reimbursement sources to expand both public and non-profit services within the juvenile justice continuum. Accessing these funds will require an interdepartmental blended funding strategy encompassing Probation, Mental Health, and Employment and Human Services.

6. SafeFutures was most effective in the sphere of county-operated services, was less effective in implementing and overseeing services within the non-profit sector, and was least effective when its initiatives required collaboration with local government institutions in West County. As a result, services were most effective when they provided intensive interventions for extremely high-risk youth, but were less effective providing prevention, early intervention, and extended aftercare in the community. This represents a missed opportunity. The experience of SafeFutures provides a number of insights into how more effective community-based early intervention services might be developed.

The non-profit agencies with whom SafeFutures worked had overall energetic, concerned, and competent line staff, but, with several exceptions, were relatively weak in the areas of management, strategic planning, accounting, data systems, purchasing, evaluation, and staff supervision. This is partially a result of choices made by the agencies themselves, who often do not see the value of such infrastructure. However, it also due to the funding practices of state, county, and city governments who fail to see that their non-profits are valuable assets in whom they should invest over the long term.

If the County wants to continue to expand partnerships on the SafeFutures model:

- Most of the non-profits with whom SafeFutures contracted lacked the basic infrastructure essential to successful modern organizations. The County should be willing to put funding into capital expenses, including computers and software, accounting and client tracking systems for non-profits. In return, they should insist that non-profits hire and/or train their staff to adequately use these tools.

- Service contracts should have reasonable allowances for administration and operating costs. Contracts should be written so that non-profits can maintain a reasonable operating reserve and depreciation fund. These are not luxuries or "profits", but basic elements of a sustainable service enterprise.

- The County and its contractors should invest time in collaborative establishment of performance objectives. Performance objectives must be mutual. On the County side, objectives should include timely execution of contracts and timely payment of invoices. On the other side, adequate contractor performance should be clearly detailed, and the county should audit performance frequently. Contractors should not be paid when they fail to serve clients or fail to document that service.

- County and contractors should have regular self-assessment sessions that include both middle management and program directors.

- The initial success of SafeFutures stemmed in part from its having a well-articulated continuum of care plan, developed with both agency and community input. A weakness in later years stemmed from a failure to revise that plan to reflect what it was learning from its programs. County/non-profit relationships

should be established within the context of an overall continuum of care plan that is revised annually with input from a broad range of stakeholders.

- Clear criteria for assessment, triage, and referral must be established. One of the major weaknesses in the SafeFutures systems was the inadequate matching of client needs with level of intervention. Clients were too-frequently served by programs that were inappropriate to meet the spectrum of their needs.

- Community capacity-building is a long-term endeavor that requires good-faith efforts on both sides. On the County side, this implies recognition that failure is part of the learning process. On the non-profit side, this implies recognition that persistent failure is not acceptable and represents a disservice to the community.

- If needed services cannot be provided by the existing group of local non-profits, the County should proactively work to identify the best non-profits in the field and recruit them to work in Contra Costa County.

A clear lesson from SafeFutures is that more collaborative relationships with units of local government offer great opportunities for improved effectiveness of interventions with at-risk youth and their families. However, more productive relationships will not be easy to achieve. Police Departments, Libraries, School Districts, Parks and Recreations Programs, and Employment Programs are all important elements of an effective continuum of care for at-risk youth. However, these institutions are spread across many jurisdictions, have narrow geographic boundaries, and are often narrowly focused on their particular mission. If the County wants to engage these jurisdictions:

- There must be a clear, shared understanding of the mission and benefit of the collaboration. The Gang Task Force, for example, failed because several of the key partners did not see a benefit from the collaboration.

- Cross-system resource sharing represents a major tool for building real collaboration. Blended funding possibilities represent a major incentive to collaboration that the County could offer local jurisdictions. Local jurisdictions, on their part, have facilities, expertise, access to clients, and unmatched general fund dollars that they can bring to the collaboration.

- As with non-profits, building these collaborations require investment of staff time, and a clear long-term strategic vision.

1. BACKGROUND

A. The National Initiative

SafeFutures is an initiative by the Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) to create program models of integrated local approaches to juvenile delinquency prevention and intervention. Under this initiative, OJJDP provided approximately $1.4 million a year for five years to each of six communities, including Contra Costa County.

The three central goals of SafeFutures include:

1. The prevention and control of juvenile violence and delinquency in targeted areas. This goal is met by focusing on three elements:

    *   Reducing risk factors associated with delinquency;

    *   Providing a continuum of services for at-risk juveniles and appropriate immediate interventions for juvenile offenders, and;

    *   The development of a range of graduated sanctions aimed at holding delinquent youth accountable, ensuring community safety, and providing appropriate treatment and rehabilitation services.

2. The development of a more efficient, effective and timely service delivery system capable of responding to the needs of at-risk and delinquent juveniles and their families at any point of entry into that system, and

3. Enhancement of the community's capacity to institutionalize and sustain the continuum of services through the expansion and diversification of funding sources.

B. Local Implementation

The Contra Costa SafeFutures Initiative was designed and has been overseen throughout its history by an advisory committee appointed by the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors: the Juvenile Systems Planning Advisory Committee (JSPAC). Program management is located in the County Administrator's Office. All of the SafeFutures programs have been operated through contract or Memorandum of Understanding with other county departments or community-based agencies. The roles of Program management included fiscal and program oversight, systems design and planning, technical assistance, liaison with OJJDP, liaison with the national evaluators, and liaison with and supervision of the local evaluation.

Contra Costa County SafeFutures program components include:

1. *Mentoring*: Three Mentoring Programs for at-risk youth:

    *   *MIND;*

    *   *Families First/Stand Up and Lead; and*

    *   *Volunteers in Probation.*

2. *Family/Schools/Community Partnership (F/S/C)*: This component began with six school based program sites:

- *Coronado Elementary;*

- *Lincoln Elementary;*

- *Nystrom Elementary;*

- *Portola Middle School;*

- *El Cerrito High School; and*

- *Kennedy High School.*

After a period of time, the staffing for the middle and high school sites was redirected into the core team, except for one staff position providing part-time counseling services at several high schools. For the period in which we have the bulk of our data, F/S/C was essentially an elementary school early intervention program.

3. *Orin Allen Youth Rehabilitation Facility Aftercare (Ranch Aftercare)*: Intensive supervision and services for 45 days following release from the Boys Ranch to the community;

4. *Summit Center*: A residential/ day treatment center for male juvenile offenders with serious emotional difficulties); and

5. *The Gang Prevention Program (Core Team)*: An array of programs providing interagency case management and service coordination for gang-involved youth residing in West County.

In all of these specific programmatic activities, SafeFutures is intended to contribute to systems change, to better interagency collaboration, and to a full continuum of sanctions in the juvenile justice system.

C. Program Evaluation

In the fall of 2000 (the fourth year of SafeFutures operation), Contra Costa County's Board of Supervisors contracted with Resource Development Associates (RDA) to provide a Program Evaluation of SafeFutures. The objectives of the evaluation included:

- Process evaluation and clarification or refinement of programmatic goals and strategies;

- Management of the Urban Institute data system, and providing data liaison with the Urban Institute, the national evaluators;

- Design of a user-friendly management information system for the project;

- Provision of regular management reports and feedback to the SafeFutures contractors and to SafeFutures management;

- Assistance with obtaining information and making decisions regarding future program sustainability;

- Implementation of an outcome evaluation;

- Assessment of "lessons learned" and policy recommendations for Contra Costa County growing out of the SafeFutures experience.

This report represents the final product of the SafeFutures evaluation, providing an overview of the Project, its accomplishments, and its implications for future enhancement of juvenile delinquency prevention and intervention systems in Contra Costa County.

Principal data sources for this report include:

- *The SafeFutures Management Information System*: The Urban Institute, evaluators of the national SafeFutures Initiative, mandated a set of data collection forms for the initiative. Coming into the initiative as it began its fifth year, RDA did not change these forms in any substantial fashion. However, RDA developed an enhanced management information system for the project that, among other features, provided real-time feedback to the service providers and managers about missing and overdue forms. Combined with sustained pressure from the Initiative's Director, this resulted in some improvement in data collection over the last year of the Initiative, and some retroactive provision of missing data for prior years. Overall, data is fairly complete for the Ranch Aftercare Component, Summit Center, and the Mentoring programs, while remaining problematic for the F/S/C and Core Team Programs.

- *The Contra Costa Futures Child and Family Data Archive*: Contra Costa County is in the process of developing a data warehouse that will pool data from the management information systems of the major youth-serving public agencies in the county for the purposes of planning, evaluation, and outcome assessment. The SafeFutures Initiative represents the first large-scale use of the Archive for outcome evaluation. For the purposes of this evaluation, youth who were served by the SafeFutures program were linked to records from the Probation Department, Children's Mental Health Services, and the West Contra Costa Unified School District to assess program outcomes. These databases were also queried to construct a matched comparison group of youth who were not served by the project. Results for this comparison group on juvenile justice recidivism were utilized to assess the impact of SafeFutures programs on their participants.

Whereas this report focuses primarily on quantitative process and outcome data, a prior report presented the results of an extensive series of key informant interviews and logic model sessions. A second report assessed potential sources for ongoing funding of SafeFutures Programs. Both of those reports are presented in the Appendices.

2. Characteristics of Clients Served

A. Participant Demographics

Table 1, below, provides demographics of SafeFutures clients who had at least a partial intake completed between January 1, 1996 and June 30, 2001. In addition to these 1890 clients who received case management services, an unknown—but certainly significant—number of clients received outreach, education, and/or brief therapy, particularly from the F/S/C and Core Team Programs. The high number of unknown values in these tables in what is certainly fundamental and easily ascertained information, such as gender, ethnicity, and age, gives an indication of the overall inadequate quality of this data, especially for the F/S/C and Core Team Programs.

Of particular note in this data is the city in which the program clients resided. Although the SafeFutures Programs were designed to provide a continuum of care, there was a significant density of services only in the Richmond/San Pablo area. Outside that area, services were either limited or non-existent. If the County intends to develop a county-wide system of care, these services would not only have to be maintained but significantly expanded. Currently, only the Ranch Aftercare Program provides significant levels of service to residents of all portions of the County. In fact, given limited resources and the prospect of a constrained state budget for the next several years, the County might want to make a conscious choice to focus services on the West County area, so as to provide a full continuum at least in the highest risk area of the County.

B. Risk and Resiliency Profile of Participants

Of the 1890 youth who received intakes, 988 were administered an initial assessment. Tables 2-7, below, summarize the risk and resiliency profiles of SafeFutures clients by Program. Overall the profile is one of substantial risk along every dimension (although the F/S/C clients, being younger than those of other components, manifest less risk across the board), complemented by significant strengths in many cases. Among the most significant findings of these assessments:

- Nearly two-thirds of the participants manifested behavior problems with peers, including a majority who exhibited physical aggression against peers. Behavior problems with respect to adults were also present, although at a lower rate.

- Substance abuse was a significant issue for participants, although this risk factor varied greatly by program component; youth in the F/S/C and Mentoring programs had a relatively low level of substance abuse risk, while two-thirds of the youth in the Summit Center, Core Team, and Ranch Aftercare programs exhibited evidence of substance abuse.

- Youth were assessed as having surprisingly low levels of gang risk. Even for the Core Team, a bare majority of youth were assessed as *at risk* of gang involvement and less than 5% were assessed as having a *history* of gang involvement. This may have more to do with the reluctance of program staff to label youth as gang members (and possibly trigger gang enhancements mandated in state law), than a bona fide assessment of fact.

- Except for Summit Center, there was also a surprisingly low assessment of mental health risk. Key informant interviews conducted earlier in the evaluation process revealed an across-the-board conviction that emotional difficulties were endemic in this population. Perhaps the low rates manifested in these assessments reflect a lack of staff training in the identification of emotional issues.

- Parent involvement in the criminal justice system was the only family risk factor affecting more than 20% of participants. However, although family substance abuse was not assessed for a majority of families, it was present in 34% of families who were assessed.

- Education risk factors were significant for SafeFutures participants. More than half were assessed positive for school disruption and frequent absenteeism. Nearly 30% were behind at least one grade level, and 15% were special education students.

- About two-thirds of the youth assessed had stable and supportive families and positive adult role models. In contrast to this, the level of individual protective factors was low: relatively small percentages of youth were involved in sports, afterschool activities, or religious/cultural activities.

- The overall risk and resiliency profile was better for F/S/C participants than for participants in other programs. This is appropriate, given the design of F/S/C to serve as an early intervention program.

Table 1
Demographics of SafeFutures Clients: 1/1/1996 through 6/30/01

	F/S/C		Mentoring		Summit Center		Ranch Aftercare		Core Team		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Gender												
Female	94	19.2%	56	87.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	184	28.2%	334	17.7%
Male	181	37.0%	8	12.5%	55	100.0%	610	97.0%	214	32.8%	1068	56.5%
Unknown	214	43.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	19	3.0%	255	39.1%	488	25.8%
Total	489	100.0%	64	100.0%	55	100.0%	629	100.0%	653	100.0%	1890	100.0%
Ethnicity												
Asian or Pacific Islander	6	1.2%	2	3.1%	1	1.8%	52	8.3%	39	6.0%	100	5.3%
Black/African American	176	36.0%	17	26.6%	14	25.5%	217	34.5%	135	20.7%	559	29.6%
Hispanic/Latino	59	12.1%	10	15.6%	5	9.1%	138	21.9%	109	16.7%	321	17.0%
Multiple Ethnicity	1	0.2%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%	1	0.1%
Native American	1	0.2%		0.0%		0.0%	1	0.2%	1	0.2%	3	0.2%
Other	3	0.6%	1	1.6%	3	5.5%	16	2.5%	8	1.2%	31	1.6%
White, non-Hispanic	3	0.6%	31	48.4%	23	41.8%	138	21.9%	18	2.8%	213	11.3%
Unknown	240	49.1%	3	4.7%	9	16.4%	67	10.7%	343	52.5%	662	35.0%
Total	489	100.0%	64	100.0%	55	100.0%	629	100.0%	653	100.0%	1890	100.0%
Age at intake												
Under 10	121	24.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	34	5.2%	155	8.2%
10	64	13.1%	1	1.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	29	4.4%	94	5.0%
11	27	5.5%	2	3.1%	0	0.0%	2	0.3%	21	3.2%	52	2.8%
12	12	2.5%	3	4.7%	0	0.0%	3	0.5%	25	3.8%	43	2.3%
13	4	0.8%	8	12.5%	8	14.5%	7	1.1%	30	4.6%	57	3.0%
14	4	0.8%	7	10.9%	9	16.4%	44	7.0%	20	3.1%	84	4.4%
15	1	0.2%	14	21.9%	11	20.0%	94	14.9%	20	3.1%	140	7.4%
16	1	0.2%	8	12.5%	16	29.1%	146	23.2%	19	2.9%	190	10.1%
17	1	0.2%	12	18.8%	11	20.0%	218	34.7%	27	4.1%	269	14.2%
Over 17	0	0.0%	4	6.3%	0	0.0%	115	18.3%	43	6.6%	162	8.6%
Unknown	254	51.9%	5	7.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	385	59.0%	644	34.1%
Total	489	100.0%	64	100.0%	55	100.0%	629	100.0%	653	100.0%	1890	100.0%
Language Proficiency												
Multilingual, Including Englis	17	3.5%	6	9.4%	7	12.7%	145	23.1%	30	4.6%	205	10.8%
Limited or no English	13	2.7%	0	0.0%	1	1.8%	13	2.1%	8	1.2%	35	1.9%
English Only	64	13.1%	51	79.7%	38	69.1%	357	56.8%	71	10.9%	581	30.7%
Unknown	395	80.8%	7	10.9%	9	16.4%	114	18.1%	544	83.3%	1069	56.6%
Total	489	100.0%	64	100.0%	55	100.0%	629	100.0%	653	100.0%	1890	100.0%
City												
Richmond	95	19.4%	5	7.8%	8	14.5%	181	28.8%	86	13.2%	375	19.8%
El Sobrante	3	0.6%	0	0.0%	1	1.8%	5	0.8%	0	0.0%	9	0.5%
San Pablo	1	0.2%	5	7.8%	3	5.5%	52	8.3%	7	1.1%	68	3.6%
Rodeo	1	0.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	12	1.9%	0	0.0%	13	0.7%
Martinez	0	0.0%	14	21.9%	19	34.5%	13	2.1%	0	0.0%	46	2.4%
Concord	0	0.0%	7	10.9%	4	7.3%	53	8.4%	1	0.2%	65	3.4%
Antioch	0	0.0%	6	9.4%	4	7.3%	63	10.0%	1	0.2%	74	3.9%
San Ramon	0	0.0%	3	4.7%	2	3.6%	5	0.8%	0	0.0%	10	0.5%
Pittsburg	0	0.0%	3	4.7%	2	3.6%	56	8.9%	0	0.0%	61	3.2%
Bay Point	0	0.0%	3	4.7%	0	0.0%	25	4.0%	0	0.0%	28	1.5%
Walnut Creek	0	0.0%	1	1.6%	1	1.8%	6	1.0%	0	0.0%	8	0.4%
El Cerrito	0	0.0%	1	1.6%	0	0.0%	5	0.8%	6	0.9%	12	0.6%
Brentwood	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.8%	13	2.1%	0	0.0%	14	0.7%
Pinole	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.8%	8	1.3%	1	0.2%	10	0.5%
Pleasant Hill	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	8	1.3%	0	0.0%	8	0.4%
Clayton	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	0.6%	0	0.0%	4	0.2%
All others	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	7.3%	15	2.4%	2	0.3%	21	1.1%
Unknown	389	79.6%	16	25.0%	5	9.1%	105	16.7%	549	84.1%	1064	56.3%
Total	489	100.0%	64	100.0%	55	100.0%	629	100.0%	653	100.0%	1890	100.0%

Table 2:
Behavioral Problems at Intake

	F/S/C		Core Team		Summit Center		Mentoring		Ranch Aftercare		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Behavior Problems with Adults												
Yes	48	47.1%	45	27.4%	41	75.9%	83	58.5%	281	53.6%	498	50.5%
No	45	44.1%	85	51.8%	10	18.5%	48	33.8%	235	44.8%	423	42.9%
Inconclusive	2	2.0%	6	3.7%	3	5.6%	5	3.5%		0.0%	16	1.6%
Not Assessed	7	6.9%	28	17.1%		0.0%	6	4.2%	8	1.5%	49	5.0%
	102	100.0%	164	100.0%	54	100.0%	142	100.0%	524	100.0%	986	100.0%
Physical Aggression with Adults												
Yes	12	11.8%	8	4.9%	15	27.8%	30	21.1%	69	13.2%	134	13.6%
No	82	80.4%	120	73.2%	33	61.1%	100	70.4%	449	85.7%	784	79.5%
Inconclusive	2	2.0%	8	4.9%		0.0%	5	3.5%		0.0%	15	1.5%
Not Assessed	6	5.9%	28	17.1%	6	11.1%	8	5.6%	7	1.3%	55	5.6%
	102	100.0%	164	100.0%	54	100.0%	143	100.7%	525	100.2%	988	100.2%
Verbal Aggression with Adults												
Yes	31	30.4%	28	17.1%	38	70.4%	75	52.8%	294	56.1%	466	47.3%
No	62	60.8%	72	43.9%	12	22.2%	55	38.7%	226	43.1%	427	43.3%
Inconclusive	2	2.0%	6	3.7%		0.0%	5	3.5%		0.0%	13	1.3%
Not Assessed	7	6.9%	28	17.1%	4	7.4%	7	4.9%	5	1.0%	51	5.2%
	102	100.0%	134	81.7%	54	100.0%	142	100.0%	525	100.2%	957	97.1%
Behavior Problems with Peers												
Yes	56	54.9%	90	54.9%	44	81.5%	99	69.7%	344	65.6%	633	64.2%
No	37	36.3%	41	25.0%	7	13.0%	33	23.2%	173	33.0%	291	29.5%
Inconclusive	3	2.9%	6	3.7%		0.0%	6	4.2%	3	0.6%	18	1.8%
Not Assessed	6	5.9%	27	16.5%	3	5.6%	5	3.5%	5	1.0%	46	4.7%
	102	100.0%	164	100.0%	54	100.0%	143	100.7%	525	100.2%	988	100.2%
Physical Aggression with Peers												
Yes	47	46.1%	72	43.9%	20	37.0%	75	52.8%	303	57.8%	517	52.4%
No	50	49.0%	58	35.4%	31	57.4%	57	40.1%	216	41.2%	412	41.8%
Inconclusive	1	1.0%	6	3.7%		0.0%	6	4.2%	2	0.4%	15	1.5%
Not Assessed	4	3.9%	28	17.1%	3	5.6%	5	3.5%	4	0.8%	44	4.5%
	102	100.0%	164	100.0%	54	100.0%	143	100.7%	525	100.2%	988	100.2%
Verbal Aggression with Peers												
Yes	49	48.0%	85	51.8%	36	66.7%	81	57.0%	359	68.5%	610	61.9%
No	45	44.1%	45	27.4%	14	25.9%	50	35.2%	161	30.7%	315	31.9%
Inconclusive	2	2.0%	6	3.7%		0.0%	6	4.2%	1	0.2%	15	1.5%
Not Assessed	6	5.9%	28	17.1%	4	7.4%	6	4.2%	5	1.0%	49	5.0%
	102	100.0%	164	100.0%	54	100.0%	143	100.7%	526	100.4%	989	100.3%

Table 3:
Substance Abuse and Gang Behaviors at Intake

	F/S/C		Core Team		Summit Center		Mentoring		Ranch Aftercare		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Indications of Substance Abuse												
Yes	0	0.0%	103	62.8%	32	59.3%	22	15.5%	386	73.7%	543	55.1%
No	95	93.1%	28	17.1%	16	29.6%	110	77.5%	112	21.4%	361	36.6%
Inconclusive	2	2.0%	4	2.4%		0.0%	5	3.5%	2	0.4%	13	1.3%
Not Assessed	5	4.9%	29	17.7%	6	11.1%	6	4.2%	25	4.8%	71	7.2%
	102	100.0%	164	100.0%	54	100.0%	143	100.7%	525	100.2%	988	100.2%
Alcohol Use												
Yes	0	0.0%	107	65.2%	25	46.3%	12	8.5%	342	65.3%	486	49.3%
No	95	93.1%	22	13.4%	20	37.0%	108	76.1%	182	34.7%	427	43.3%
Inconclusive	2	2.0%	3	1.8%	0	0.0%	8	5.6%	0	0.0%	13	1.3%
Not Assessed	5	4.9%	32	19.5%	9	16.7%	15	10.6%	1	0.2%	62	6.3%
	102	100.0%	164	100.0%	54	100.0%	143	100.7%	525	100.2%	988	100.2%
Marijuana Use												
Yes	0	0.0%	111	67.7%	36	66.7%	22	15.5%	435	83.0%	604	61.3%
No	94	92.2%	19	11.6%	13	24.1%	100	70.4%	87	16.6%	313	31.7%
Inconclusive	2	2.0%	3	1.8%	0	0.0%	9	6.3%	0	0.0%	14	1.4%
Not Assessed	6	5.9%	31	18.9%	5	9.3%	12	8.5%	3	0.6%	57	5.8%
	102	100.0%	164	100.0%	54	100.0%	143	100.7%	525	100.2%	988	100.2%
Risk of Gang Invovlement												
Yes	1	1.0%	88	53.7%	13	24.1%	3	2.1%	134	25.6%	239	24.2%
No	86	84.3%	48	29.3%	31	57.4%	128	90.1%	386	73.7%	679	68.9%
Inconclusive	4	3.9%	0	0.0%	1	1.9%	6	4.2%	0	0.0%	11	1.1%
Not Assessed	11	10.8%	28	17.1%	9	16.7%	6	4.2%	5	1.0%	59	6.0%
	102	100.0%	164	100.0%	54	100.0%	143	100.7%	525	100.2%	988	100.2%
History of Gang Involvement												
Yes	0	0.0%	8	4.9%	2	3.7%	4	2.8%	7	1.3%	21	2.1%
No	9	8.8%	1	0.6%	2	3.7%	17	12.0%	39	7.4%	68	6.9%
Inconclusive	1	1.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	1.4%	1	0.2%	4	0.4%
Not Assessed	92	90.2%	155	94.5%	50	92.6%	120	84.5%	478	91.2%	895	90.8%
	102	100.0%	164	100.0%	54	100.0%	143	100.7%	525	100.2%	988	100.2%

Table 4:
Emotional and Physical Health Issues at Intake

	F/S/C		Core Team		Summit Center		Mentoring		Ranch Aftercare		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Evidence of Emotional Difficulties												
Yes	21	20.6%	30	18.3%	36	66.7%	73	51.4%	81	15.5%	241	24.4%
No	60	58.8%	99	60.4%	12	22.2%	40	28.2%	441	84.2%	652	66.1%
Inconclusive	5	4.9%	7	4.3%	1	1.9%	15	10.6%		0.0%	28	2.8%
Not Assessed	16	15.7%	28	17.1%	5	9.3%	15	10.6%	3	0.6%	67	6.8%
	102	100.0%	164	100.0%	54	100.0%	143	100.7%	525	100.2%	988	100.2%
Mental Health Diagnosis												
Yes	1	1.0%	5	3.0%	47	87.0%	21	14.8%	21	4.0%	95	9.6%
No	81	79.4%	124	75.6%	5	9.3%	99	69.7%	490	93.5%	799	81.0%
Inconclusive	5	4.9%	7	4.3%		0.0%	12	8.5%	3	0.6%	27	2.7%
Not Assessed	15	14.7%	28	17.1%	2	3.7%	11	7.7%	11	2.1%	67	6.8%
	102	100.0%	164	100.0%	54	100.0%	143	100.7%	525	100.2%	988	100.2%
Physical Health Problem												
Yes	5	4.9%	7	4.3%	24	44.4%	33	23.2%	32	6.1%	101	10.2%
No	78	76.5%	113	68.9%	22	40.7%	94	66.2%	484	92.4%	791	80.2%
Inconclusive	4	3.9%	15	9.1%	1	1.9%	10	7.0%	0	0.0%	30	3.0%
Not Assessed	15	14.7%	29	17.7%	7	13.0%	6	4.2%	9	1.7%	66	6.7%
	102	100.0%	164	100.0%	54	100.0%	143	100.7%	525	100.2%	988	100.2%

Table 5:
Family Risk Factors

	F/S/C		Core Team		Summit Center		Mentoring		Ranch Aftercare		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Substance Abuse in Family												
Yes	1	1.0%	12	7.3%	19	35.2%	24	16.9%	94	17.9%	150	15.2%
No	39	38.2%	32	19.5%	8	14.8%	36	25.4%	159	30.3%	274	27.8%
Inconclusive	4	3.9%	14	8.5%	1	1.9%	15	10.6%	9	1.7%	43	4.4%
Not Assessed	58	56.9%	106	64.6%	26	48.1%	68	47.9%	263	50.2%	521	52.8%
	102	100.0%	164	100.0%	54	100.0%	143	100.7%	525	100.2%	988	100.2%
Parent/Caregiver Unemployed												
Yes	13	12.7%	19	11.6%	21	38.9%	70	49.3%	133	25.4%	256	26.0%
No	63	61.8%	108	65.9%	26	48.1%	52	36.6%	375	71.6%	624	63.3%
Inconclusive	8	7.8%	6	3.7%		0.0%	4	2.8%	6	1.1%	24	2.4%
Not Assessed	18	17.6%	31	18.9%	7	13.0%	17	12.0%	11	2.1%	84	8.5%
	102	100.0%	164	100.0%	54	100.0%	143	100.7%	525	100.2%	988	100.2%
Family at Risk of Homelessness												
Yes	6	5.9%	6	3.7%	5	9.3%	41	28.9%	15	2.9%	73	7.4%
No	74	72.5%	103	62.8%	31	57.4%	72	50.7%	380	72.5%	660	66.9%
Inconclusive	6	5.9%	15	9.1%	2	3.7%	8	5.6%	17	3.2%	48	4.9%
Not Assessed	16	15.7%	40	24.4%	16	29.6%	22	15.5%	113	21.6%	207	21.0%
	102	100.0%	164	100.0%	54	100.0%	143	100.7%	525	100.2%	988	100.2%
Periods of Insufficient Food												
Yes	8	7.8%	4	2.4%	5	9.3%	52	36.6%	27	5.2%	96	9.7%
No	73	71.6%	96	58.5%	33	61.1%	67	47.2%	365	69.7%	634	64.3%
Inconclusive	4	3.9%	21	12.8%	2	3.7%	4	2.8%	24	4.6%	55	5.6%
Not Assessed	17	16.7%	43	26.2%	14	25.9%	20	14.1%	109	20.8%	203	20.6%
	102	100.0%	164	100.0%	54	100.0%	143	100.7%	525	100.2%	988	100.2%
Insufficient Clothing for School												
Yes	8	7.8%	3	1.8%	2	3.7%	49	34.5%	19	3.6%	81	8.2%
No	73	71.6%	99	60.4%	36	66.7%	73	51.4%	374	71.4%	655	66.4%
Inconclusive	5	4.9%	20	12.2%	2	3.7%	4	2.8%	23	4.4%	54	5.5%
Not Assessed	16	15.7%	42	25.6%	14	25.9%	17	12.0%	109	20.8%	198	20.1%
	102	100.0%	164	100.0%	54	100.0%	143	100.7%	525	100.2%	988	100.2%
Domestic Violence												
Yes	6	5.9%	4	2.4%	20	37.0%	27	19.0%	44	8.4%	101	10.2%
No	67	65.7%	118	72.0%	20	37.0%	74	52.1%	397	75.8%	676	68.6%
Inconclusive	8	7.8%	10	6.1%	4	7.4%	16	11.3%	22	4.2%	60	6.1%
Not Assessed	21	20.6%	32	19.5%	10	18.5%	26	18.3%	62	11.8%	151	15.3%
	102	100.0%	164	100.0%	54	100.0%	143	100.7%	525	100.2%	988	100.2%
Family member(s) gang-involved												
Yes	0	0.0%	17	10.4%	2	3.7%	5	3.5%	29	5.5%	53	5.4%
No	39	38.2%	24	14.6%	20	37.0%	49	34.5%	166	31.7%	298	30.2%
Inconclusive	4	3.9%	6	3.7%	2	3.7%	13	9.2%	2	0.4%	27	2.7%
Not Assessed	59	57.8%	117	71.3%	30	55.6%	76	53.5%	328	62.6%	610	61.9%
	102	100.0%	164	100.0%	54	100.0%	143	100.7%	525	100.2%	988	100.2%
Parents in Criminal Justice System												
Yes	6	5.9%	19	11.6%	11	20.4%	37	26.1%	173	33.0%	246	24.9%
No	54	52.9%	111	67.7%	29	53.7%	69	48.6%	338	64.5%	601	61.0%
Inconclusive	15	14.7%	5	3.0%	2	3.7%	9	6.3%	4	0.8%	35	3.5%
Not Assessed	27	26.5%	29	17.7%	12	22.2%	28	19.7%	10	1.9%	106	10.8%
	102	100.0%	164	100.0%	54	100.0%	143	100.7%	525	100.2%	988	100.2%
Any child in foster care or out-of-home placement												
Yes	3	2.9%	3	1.8%	3	5.6%	16	11.3%	16	3.1%	41	4.2%
No	65	63.7%	45	27.4%	26	48.1%	70	49.3%	270	51.5%	476	48.3%
Inconclusive	4	3.9%	5	3.0%	1	1.9%	6	4.2%	0	0.0%	16	1.6%
Not Assessed	30	29.4%	111	67.7%	24	44.4%	51	35.9%	239	45.6%	455	46.1%
	102	100.0%	164	100.0%	54	100.0%	143	100.7%	525	100.2%	988	100.2%

Table 6:

Educational Risk Factors

	F/S/C		Core Team		Summit Center		Mentoring		Ranch Aftercare		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
School Disruption												
Yes	82	80.4%	64	39.0%	49	90.7%	69	48.6%	255	48.7%	519	52.6%
No	54	52.9%	82	50.0%	5	9.3%	60	42.3%	192	36.6%	393	39.9%
Not Assessed	14	13.7%	40	24.4%	4	7.4%	15	10.6%	83	15.8%	156	15.8%
	150	147.1%	186	113.4%	58	107.4%	144	101.4%	530	101.1%	1068	108.3%
Frequent Absenteeism												
Yes	9	8.8%	75	45.7%	31	57.4%	64	45.1%	378	72.1%	557	56.5%
No	114	111.8%	71	43.3%	21	38.9%	65	45.8%	110	21.0%	381	38.6%
Not Assessed	27	26.5%	40	24.4%	6	11.1%	15	10.6%	42	8.0%	130	13.2%
	150	147.1%	186	113.4%	58	107.4%	144	101.4%	530	101.1%	1068	108.3%
Behind in Grade												
Yes	24	23.5%	25	15.2%	20	37.0%	69	48.6%	153	29.2%	291	29.5%
No	101	99.0%	114	69.5%	29	53.7%	60	42.3%	273	52.1%	577	58.5%
Not Assessed	25	24.5%	47	28.7%	9	16.7%	15	10.6%	104	19.8%	200	20.3%
	150	147.1%	186	113.4%	58	107.4%	144	101.4%	530	101.1%	1068	108.3%
History of Truancy												
Yes	7	6.9%	97	59.1%	28	51.9%	34	23.9%	214	40.8%	380	38.5%
No	115	112.7%	56	34.1%	22	40.7%	86	60.6%	245	46.8%	524	53.1%
Not Assessed	28	27.5%	33	20.1%	8	14.8%	24	16.9%	71	13.5%	164	16.6%
	150	147.1%	186	113.4%	58	107.4%	144	101.4%	530	101.1%	1068	108.3%
History of Expulsion												
Yes	1	1.0%	14	8.5%	17	31.5%	17	12.0%	46	8.8%	95	9.6%
No	122	119.6%	116	70.7%	31	57.4%	100	70.4%	359	68.5%	728	73.8%
Not Assessed	27	26.5%	56	34.1%	10	18.5%	27	19.0%	125	23.9%	245	24.8%
	150	147.1%	186	113.4%	58	107.4%	144	101.4%	530	101.1%	1068	108.3%
History of Suspension												
Yes	15	14.7%	42	25.6%	24	44.4%	39	27.5%	139	26.5%	259	26.3%
No	109	106.9%	95	57.9%	27	50.0%	81	57.0%	296	56.5%	608	61.7%
Not Assessed	26	25.5%	49	29.9%	7	13.0%	24	16.9%	95	18.1%	201	20.4%
	150	147.1%	186	113.4%	58	107.4%	144	101.4%	530	101.1%	1068	108.3%
Special Education Student												
Yes	8	7.8%	13	7.9%	27	50.0%	31	21.8%	75	14.3%	154	15.6%
No	113	110.8%	116	70.7%	25	46.3%	91	64.1%	338	64.5%	683	69.3%
Not Assessed	29	28.4%	57	34.8%	6	11.1%	22	15.5%	117	22.3%	231	23.4%
	150	147.1%	186	113.4%	58	107.4%	144	101.4%	530	101.1%	1068	108.3%
Teen/Expectant Parent												
Yes	0	0.0%	6	3.7%	1	1.9%	7	4.9%	19	3.6%	33	3.3%
No	93	91.2%	159	97.0%	46	85.2%	122	85.9%	478	91.2%	898	91.1%
Not Assessed	49	48.0%	17	10.4%	11	20.4%	16	11.3%	32	6.1%	125	12.7%
	142	139.2%	182	111.0%	58	107.4%	145	102.1%	529	101.0%	1056	107.1%

Table 7:
Protective/Resiliency Factors

	F/S/C		Core Team		Summit Center		Mentoring		Ranch Aftercare		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Parent/Caregiver Support												
Yes	68	66.7%	123	75.0%	45	77.6%	87	60.8%	151	28.8%	474	47.8%
No	6	5.9%	9	5.5%	4	6.9%	31	21.7%	53	10.1%	103	10.4%
Inconclusive	10	9.8%	1	0.6%	1	1.7%	14	9.8%	6	1.1%	32	3.2%
Not Assessed	18	17.6%	31	18.9%	8	13.8%	11	7.7%	315	60.0%	383	38.6%
	102	100.0%	164	100.0%	58	100.0%	143	100.0%	525	100.0%	992	100.0%
Stable Home Environment												
Yes	54	52.9%	87	53.0%	29	53.7%	51	35.7%	353	67.2%	574	58.1%
No	15	14.7%	40	24.4%	17	31.5%	71	49.7%	146	27.8%	289	29.3%
Inconclusive	14	13.7%	7	4.3%	1	1.9%	10	7.0%	7	1.3%	39	3.9%
Not Assessed	19	18.6%	30	18.3%	7	13.0%	11	7.7%	19	3.6%	86	8.7%
	102	100.0%	164	100.0%	54	100.0%	143	100.0%	525	100.0%	988	100.0%
Positive Peer Support												
Yes	31	30.4%	25	15.2%	3	5.6%	24	16.8%	46	8.8%	129	13.1%
No	32	31.4%	103	62.8%	40	74.1%	90	62.9%	454	86.5%	719	72.8%
Inconclusive	11	10.8%	7	4.3%	1	1.9%	14	9.8%	12	2.3%	45	4.6%
Not Assessed	28	27.5%	29	17.7%	10	18.5%	15	10.5%	13	2.5%	95	9.6%
	102	100.0%	164	100.0%	54	100.0%	143	100.0%	525	100.0%	988	100.0%
Prosocial Adult Models												
Yes	60	58.8%	103	62.8%	21	38.9%	64	44.8%	317	60.4%	565	57.2%
No	7	6.9%	25	15.2%	28	51.9%	54	37.8%	167	31.8%	281	28.4%
Inconclusive	10	9.8%	7	4.3%	0	0.0%	12	8.4%	19	3.6%	48	4.9%
Not Assessed	25	24.5%	29	17.7%	5	9.3%	13	9.1%	22	4.2%	94	9.5%
	102	100.0%	164	100.0%	54	100.0%	143	100.0%	525	100.0%	988	100.0%
Academic Proficiency Honors												
Yes	34	33.3%	10	6.1%	8	14.8%	30	21.0%	45	8.6%	127	12.9%
No	32	31.4%	116	70.7%	38	70.4%	88	61.5%	451	85.9%	725	73.4%
Inconclusive	20	19.6%	8	4.9%		0.0%	13	9.1%	3	0.6%	44	4.5%
Not Assessed	16	15.7%	30	18.3%	8	14.8%	12	8.4%	26	5.0%	92	9.3%
	102	100.0%	164	100.0%	54	100.0%	143	100.0%	525	100.0%	988	100.0%
Positive Group Activities												
Yes	59	57.8%	19	11.6%	10	18.5%	46	32.2%	49	9.3%	183	18.5%
No	23	22.5%	109	66.5%	32	59.3%	75	52.4%	366	69.7%	605	61.2%
Inconclusive	6	5.9%	5	3.0%	3	5.6%	9	6.3%	1	0.2%	24	2.4%
Not Assessed	14	13.7%	31	18.9%	9	16.7%	13	9.1%	109	20.8%	176	17.8%
	102	100.0%	164	100.0%	54	100.0%	143	100.0%	525	100.0%	988	100.0%
Sports Team Member												
Yes	29	28.4%	1	0.6%	3	5.6%	20	14.0%	61	11.6%	114	11.5%
No	53	52.0%	131	79.9%	39	72.2%	103	72.0%	450	85.7%	776	78.5%
Inconclusive	4	3.9%	2	1.2%	1	1.9%	7	4.9%	0	0.0%	14	1.4%
Not Assessed	16	15.7%	30	18.3%	11	20.4%	13	9.1%	14	2.7%	84	8.5%
	102	100.0%	164	100.0%	54	100.0%	143	100.0%	525	100.0%	988	100.0%
Organized Afterschool Activities												
Yes	46	45.1%	10	6.1%	4	7.4%	20	14.0%	38	7.2%	118	11.9%
No	37	36.3%	120	73.2%	39	72.2%	102	71.3%	468	89.1%	766	77.5%
Inconclusive	6	5.9%	5	3.0%	1	1.9%	7	4.9%	3	0.6%	22	2.2%
Not Assessed	13	12.7%	29	17.7%	10	18.5%	14	9.8%	16	3.0%	82	8.3%
	102	100.0%	164	100.0%	54	100.0%	143	100.0%	525	100.0%	988	100.0%

Protective/Resiliency Factors, continued

	F/S/C		Core Team		Summit Center		Mentoring		Ranch Aftercare		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Religious/Cultural Attachment												
Yes	36	35.3%	50	30.5%	11	20.4%	29	20.3%	82	15.6%	208	21.1%
No	30	29.4%	75	45.7%	33	61.1%	91	63.6%	423	80.6%	652	66.0%
Inconclusive	9	8.8%	5	3.0%	1	1.9%	6	4.2%	3	0.6%	24	2.4%
Not Assessed	27	26.5%	34	20.7%	9	16.7%	17	11.9%	17	3.2%	104	10.5%
	102	100.0%	164	100.0%	54	100.0%	143	100.0%	525	100.0%	988	100.0%
Ethnic/Cultural Activities												
Yes	34	33.3%	47	28.7%	3	5.6%	13	9.1%	70	13.3%	167	16.9%
No	33	32.4%	76	46.3%	39	72.2%	108	75.5%	433	82.5%	689	69.7%
Inconclusive	11	10.8%	6	3.7%	1	1.9%	7	4.9%	4	0.8%	29	2.9%
Not Assessed	24	23.5%	35	21.3%	11	20.4%	15	10.5%	18	3.4%	103	10.4%
	102	100.0%	164	100.0%	54	100.0%	143	100.0%	525	100.0%	988	100.0%
Working Toward Future Goals												
Yes	27	26.5%	106	64.6%	26	48.1%	42	29.4%	111	21.1%	312	31.6%
No	35	34.3%	17	10.4%	18	33.3%	76	53.1%	383	73.0%	529	53.5%
Inconclusive	12	11.8%	6	3.7%	0	0.0%	14	9.8%	1	0.2%	33	3.3%
Not Assessed	28	27.5%	35	21.3%	10	18.5%	11	7.7%	30	5.7%	114	11.5%
	102	100.0%	164	100.0%	54	100.0%	143	100.0%	525	100.0%	988	100.0%
Strong Interests/Skills												
Yes	46	45.1%	105	64.0%	29	53.7%	49	34.3%	140	26.7%	369	37.3%
No	11	10.8%	9	5.5%	17	31.5%	60	42.0%	195	37.1%	292	29.6%
Inconclusive	16	15.7%	13	7.9%	2	3.7%	19	13.3%	39	7.4%	89	9.0%
Not Assessed	29	28.4%	37	22.6%	6	11.1%	15	10.5%	151	28.8%	238	24.1%
	102	100.0%	164	100.0%	54	100.0%	143	100.0%	525	100.0%	988	100.0%
Character Strengths												
Yes	41	40.2%	107	65.2%	31	57.4%	73	51.0%	93	17.7%	345	34.9%
No	15	14.7%	7	4.3%	14	25.9%	39	27.3%	174	33.1%	249	25.2%
Inconclusive	15	14.7%	10	6.1%	0	0.0%	18	12.6%	57	10.9%	100	10.1%
Not Assessed	31	30.4%	40	24.4%	9	16.7%	13	9.1%	201	38.3%	294	29.8%
	102	100.0%	164	100.0%	54	100.0%	143	100.0%	525	100.0%	988	100.0%

3. OUTCOME ANALYSIS

A. Program Services and Juvenile Justice Recidivism

For this analysis, RDA created a comparison group by attempting to match each youth served by a SafeFutures program with a comparison youth who was matched on the following variables:

- Same gender;

- Same ethnicity;

- Same age;

- Same number of probation referrals (±1) within the 12 months prior to the experimental youth entering the SafeFutures Program;

Data for identifying the comparison sample was obtained from a download of juvenile probation referrals from the Contra Costa County Probation Department MIS system. Since it was our objective to study the long-term impact of Safe Futures programs on juvenile recidivism, we excluded youth who were 18 or older at the time of intervention, since they would "age out" of the system before the end of our follow-up period. Because comparison youth were matched on age, 18 year olds were also excluded from our comparison sample.

Table 8, below, presents the results of an analysis of the level of offending for Summit Center, OAYRF Aftercare, the Core Team, and the Mentoring Programs[2] for three time-periods:

- The 12 months immediately before the youth entered the SafeFutures Program

- The 6 months after the youth entered the SafeFutures Program

- The period from 7-18 months after the youth entered the SafeFutures Program.

Because we were interested in examining recidivism rates, we included in our analysis only probation referrals that were the result of a *new* offense. Our reasoning was that youth who were under intensive supervision might be expected to have a higher level of violations for procedural issues such as probation violations, failure to report, etc. However, this type of offending could be seen as a natural consequence of the enhanced service level, rather than as an indication of delinquent behavior. Consequently, these types of offenses were excluded for both the experimental and the comparison groups.

---

[2] The other SafeFutures component, the F/S/C Counseling Program is a program focusing on elementary school students and had an inadequate number of youth with probation records (7) to be included in this analysis.

Table 8:
Probation Referrals
SafeFutures Clients vs. Matched Comparison Group

		12 Months prior to intake	6 months after intake	7-18 months after intake
Summit Center n=67				
Experimental Group	Total Referrals	176	40	42
	Mean	2.63	0.59	0.63
	St Dev.	2.35	0.92	1.29
Comparison Group	Total Referrals	156	45	92
	Mean	2.33	0.67	1.37
	St Dev.	2.11	0.75	1.23
Aftercare n=595				
Experimental Group	Total Referrals	1756	389	407
	Mean	2.95	0.65	0.68
	St Dev.	2.76	1.03	1.95
Comparison Group	Total Referrals	1744	557	741
	Mean	2.93	0.94	1.12
	St Dev.	2.73	1.47	2.26
Core Team n=101				
Experimental Group	Total Referrals	119	37	99
	Mean	1.18	0.37	0.98
	St Dev.	1.70	0.70	1.65
Comparison Group	Total Referrals	119	50	135
	Mean	1.18	0.50	1.34
	St Dev.	1.70	1.14	2.39
Mentoring n=69				
Experimental Group	Total Referrals	136	51	75
	Mean	1.97	0.74	1.09
	St Dev.	2.11	1.12	1.85
Comparison Group	Total Referrals	136	56	140
	Mean	1.97	0.81	2.03
	St Dev.	2.11	1.38	3.14

At this Table indicates, participants in each of these programs showed a reduction in recidivism in the six months after program entry.[3] Even more encouraging, these gains

---

[3] Unfortunately, a quirk of the design of the original data collection system does not allow us to track the length of program participation of participants. We have used the "six months after intake" analysis period as an estimate of the actual intervention period.

appear to be sustained throughout the subsequent 12-month period. Results were most positive for the Summit Center and Aftercare Programs.

Table 9 provides a (one-tailed) Z test of change in frequency of offending over time. All changes were in the direction of a reduced level of recidivism over time. All program participants manifested statistically significant reductions between the baseline period (12 months prior to program entry) and both the intervention period (six months after program entry), and the subsequent 12 months (months 7-18 after program entry), except for the Core Team in the second measurement period. These are extremely strong results and suggest that these programs are indeed having a significant impact on recidivism of participants.

Table 9: Z test of within-group offending over time

	t_0 to t_1		t_0 to t_2	
	Z	α	Z	α
Summit Center	**4.67**	**<.0001**	**6.06**	**<.0001**
Aftercare	**6.94**	**<.0001**	**2.70**	**.0002**
Core Team	**2.41**	**.008**	.85	.2
Mentoring	**1.70**	**.04**	**2.60**	**.005**

t_0 – Mean offenses in 12 months prior to intervention
t_1 – Mean offenses in 6 months after commencement of intervention
t_2 – Mean offenses 7-18 months after commencement of intervention

Statistically significant results are in bold. Because t_1 was a six month period whereas t_0 and t_2 were 12 month periods, the mean for t_1 was actually doubled in calculating the Z score.

A more rigorous test of the effectiveness of these programs is to compare the offense level of participants in the programs with that of the (matched) non-participants in the comparison group. Table 10 presents this comparison. Once again, all of the results are in a favorable direction for the SafeFutures Programs. In the period t_1 (0-6 months after intake) only the Ranch Aftercare program shows a result that is statistically significant. However, in the period t_2 (7-18 months after intake), the results are significant for all programs except the Core Team. Once again, these results suggest that the sustained programmatic interventions provided by SafeFutures Programs have a positive effect in comparison to the more episodic services available to the services-as-usual comparison group.

Table 10: Z test of experimental vs comparison group offending at time t_1 and t_2

	t_1		t_2	
	Z	α	Z	α
Summit Center	.55	.29	**3.37**	**.0004**
Aftercare	**3.94**	**<.0001**	**2.70**	**.0002**
Core Team	.98	.16	1.25	.11
Mentoring	.33	.37	**2.14**	**.02**

t_1 – Mean offenses in 6 months after commencement of intervention
t_2 – Mean offenses 7-18 months after commencement of intervention

Statistically significant results are in bold. Because t_1 was a six month period whereas t_0 and t_2 were 12 month periods, the mean for t_1 was actually doubled in calculating the Z score.

B. Program Services and Educational Outcomes

We next linked the experimental group to school records downloaded from the West Contra Costa Unified School District. This download covered the five-year period from the 1995-96 school year through the 1999-2000 school year. There were a number of limitations that precluded us from making a 100% match:

- Although SafeFutures Programs have tended to focus on the area served by the West Contra Costa Unified School District, some clients attend schools in other districts and some are drop-outs.

- For elementary school students (the bulk of those served by the FSC Program), we did not have attendance data. Although we did have STAR test data for elementary school students, this test was not administered until 1997-98. Moreover, rates of participation in the test were relatively low for the schools served by the SafeFutures programs.

- RDA has not yet received a download of data from WCCUSD for the 2000-2001 school year. This means that the last STAR scores that were available for this analysis were those administered in the Spring of 2000, and the last attendance data was for the 1999-2000 school year.

- Inadequacies in the data collection and data entry process—on both sides—made it difficult to establish secure links between the data sets.

Due to the difficulty of matching and linking records, the results presented below should not be regarded as definitive, but only as suggestive. [4]

Because school data is aggregated by year, we were compelled to utilize different analysis periods than in the previous section. Periods utilized for this analysis were:

1. Baseline Year: the school year prior to the client's entry into the SafeFutures Program

2. Intervention Year: The school year in which the client entered the SafeFutures Program

3. Post-intervention Year: The school year after the client's entry into the SafeFutures Program.

We measured three attendance variables:

- Total days absent as a percent of school days enrolled;

- Total days of unexcused absences as a percent of school days enrolled;

- Total days suspended as a percent of days enrolled.

Most studies that have examined the impact of intervention programs on school attendance have focused on "truancy", as determined by *unexcused* absences. Prima facie examination of records for the various schools in the West Contra Costa District suggested that there is great variation by school and by grade level in the rigor with

---

[4] Results for Summit Center are not presented at all due to an extremely small n (6).

which the distinction between excused and unexcused absences is maintained. Consequently, we decided to look both at total days missed as well as at unexcused absences and suspensions.

When we attempted to construct a matched comparison group for educational data as we did for the juvenile probation data, the numbers of participant-comparison pairs who had a complete set of baseline/intervention/post-intervention data were so small that we abandoned the analysis as unreliable.

As Table 11 indicates, results are mixed. The Aftercare Program manifested a very large improvement in each measure of attendance. In both the intervention and the post-intervention periods, percentage of days absent was reduced to slightly over one-third the pre-intervention level, while truancy and suspensions also showed declines. This program has had a particular emphasis on school enrollment and school attendance that has clearly born fruit. This is a program approach that would clearly be well to replicate not only throughout SafeFutures, but in other Probation Department programs as well.

Of the other three programs only Mentoring showed general declines between the pre-intervention period and the succeeding two years. However these declines were fairly modest. Core Team participants had mixed results, while F/S/C participants' attendance actually worsened over time.

Table 12 provides a (one-tailed) Z test of changes in the three measures of attendance over time. The Ranch Aftercare Program had a statistically significant improvement in attendance in five of six possible measures. F/S/C participants actually manifested a statistically significant decline in attendance. However, we would ascribe this result to the fact that most of the participants of this program for whom we had attendance data were in early middle school, a time when attendance characteristically declines across the board.

Table 13, unfortunately, shows that educational achievement (at least as measured by standardized test scores) is a more difficult issue than school attendance. In none of the components presented are there significant improvements (or declines) in the national percentile rankings of SafeFutures clients during either the intervention or the post-intervention periods. This finding is consistent with the results of juvenile offender programs nationwide, who have found that improving educational performance is a much more difficult task than improving attendance, requiring sustained attention and resource allocation over a period of years in order to achieve significant gains.

Table II
School Attendance of SafeFutures Clients

	T_0: School Year Prior to Intervention		T_1: School Year of Intervention		T_2: School Year after Intervention	
	%	StdDev	%	StdDev	%	StdDev
Ranch Aftercare n=55						
Absences as a percentage of total days enrolled	15.95	19.68	7.64	18.37	5.98	13.44
Unexcused absences as a percentage of total days enrolled	8.40	16.34	5.36	14.31	3.75	11.02
Days suspended as a percentage of total days enrolled	4.04	6.27	1.20	4.66	0.65	2.13
Core Team n=208						
Absences as a percentage of total days enrolled	7.91	11.33	9.95	12.98	6.04	9.66
Unexcused absences as a percentage of total days enrolled	2.36	7.36	4.00	10.23	2.45	7.05
Days suspended as a percentage of total days enrolled	2.15	4.13	2.65	4.43	1.48	2.87
Mentoring n=50						
Absences as a percentage of total days enrolled	3.82	11.38	2.17	6.52	2.03	5.19
Unexcused absences as a percentage of total days enrolled	0.92	3.35	0.42	1.61	0.74	2.29
Days suspended as a percentage of total days enrolled	0.82	3.31	0.62	2.10	0.42	1.25
F/S/C n=32						
Absences as a percentage of total days enrolled	0.65	2.00	0.64	1.94	3.01	3.42
Unexcused absences as a percentage of total days enrolled	0.03	0.10	0.25	0.76	0.78	1.47
Days suspended as a percentage of total days enrolled	0.28	0.85	0.13	0.38	1.28	1.60

Table 12
Z test of within-group attendance patterns over time

	t_0 to t_1		t_0 to t_2	
	Z	α	Z	α
Aftercare				
Absences	**2.27**	**.01**	**3.07**	**.0001**
Unexcused	1.03	.15	**1.73**	**.04**
Suspension	**2.67**	**.004**	**3.76**	**.0001**
Core Team				
Absences	-.87	.19	.92	.18
Unexcused	-.95	.17	-.06	.48
Suspension	-.60	.27	.97	.17
Mentoring				
Absences	.92	.18	1.05	.15
Unexcused	.99	.16	.33	.37
Suspension	.37	.36	.83	.20
Aftercare				
Absences	.03	.49	**4.38**	**<.0001**
Unexcused	**-2.10**	**.02**	**3.74**	**.0001**
Suspension	1.18	.12	**4.05**	**<.0001**

t_0 – Mean days missed as a percent of days enrolled in school year prior to intervention
t_1 – Mean days missed as a percent of days enrolled in school year of intervention
t_2 – Mean days missed as a percent of days enrolled in school year after intervention

Statistically significant results are in bold.

Table 13
STAR Scores of SafeFutures Participants

	N	School Year Prior to Intervention	School Year of Intervention	School Year after Intervention
Ranch Aftercare	50	15.32	13.14	15.86
Core Team	98	25.04	23.78	24.93
Mentoring	18	22.28	23.94	25.61
F/S/C	42	16.95	20.76	22.83

Attachment I

Contra Costa County SafeFutures Program Evaluation:
Qualitative Evaluation Report

1. BACKGROUND

A. The National SafeFutures Initiative

Under the SafeFutures project, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) provides approximately $1.4 million a year for five years to each of six communities. SafeFutures assists those communities with existing collaboration efforts to reduce youth violence and delinquency. SafeFutures also seeks to improve the service delivery system by creating a *continuum of care* that is responsive to the needs of youth and their families at any point that they have contact with the program. This coordinated approach of prevention, intervention and treatment is based on the needs and assets of the targeted youth in each community. It involves both public and private sector agencies, including health, mental health, child welfare, education, police, probation, courts and corrections.

The three central goals of SafeFutures include:

4. The prevention and control of juvenile violence and delinquency in targeted areas. This goal is met by focusing on three elements:

   - Reducing risk factors associated with delinquency;

   - Providing a continuum of services for at-risk juveniles and appropriate immediate interventions for juvenile offenders, and;

   - The development of a range of graduated sanctions aimed at holding delinquent youth accountable, ensuring community safety, and providing appropriate treatment and rehabilitation services.

5. The development of a more efficient, effective and timely service delivery system capable of responding to the needs of at-risk and delinquent juveniles and their families at any point of entry into that system, and

6. Enhancement of the community's capacity to institutionalize and sustain the continuum of services through the expansion and diversification of funding sources.

B. The Contra Costa County SafeFutures Initiative

The Contra Costa SafeFutures initiative, managed by the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors and advised by a SafeFutures steering committee and the Juvenile Systems Planning Advisory Committee, was built on community-wide planning efforts that began in Contra Costa County as early as 1979. Highlights of Contra Costa's initiative include mental health services for severely emotionally disturbed youth, gender specific services for girls, gang intervention, and a true system of graduated sanctions that includes a coordinated aftercare case management component. The overall initiative emphasizes family and school based services for at-risk youth.

Contra Costa County SafeFutures program components include:

6. Three Mentoring Programs:

    - *MIND;*

    - *Families First / Stand Up and Lead; and*

    - *Volunteers in Probation*

7. Six school based program sites:

    - *Coronado Elementary;*

    - *Lincoln Elementary;*

    - *Nystrom Elementary;*

    - *Portola Middle School;*

    - *El Cerrito High School; and*

    - *Kennedy High School*

8. OAYRF aftercare (intensive supervision and services for 45 days following release from the Boys Ranch to the community);

9. Summit Center (a residential/ day treatment center for male juvenile offenders with serious emotional difficulties); and

10. The Gang Prevention Program in West County (an array of programs based on the Spergel model and including interagency case management).

In all of these specific programmatic activities, SafeFutures is intended to contribute to systems change, to better interagency collaboration, and to a full continuum of sanctions in the juvenile justice system.

C. The Local Program Evaluation

In the fall of 2000, Contra Costa County's Board of Supervisors contracted with Resource Development Associates (RDA) to provide a Program Evaluation of SafeFutures. This Program Evaluation will examine activities and outcomes over the past four years and will lay the groundwork for continuing the program beyond its fifth year. The evaluation includes three basic tasks:

- Process evaluation and clarification or refinement of programmatic goals and strategies;

- Management of the Urban Institute data system and reporting feedback to the SafeFutures managers; and

- Assistance with obtaining information and making decisions regarding future program sustainability.

RDA agreed to provide SafeFutures in early 2001 with a brief feedback report, summarizing the key informant interviews and the "logic model" sessions with each program component as well as highlighting individual program achievements.[5] RDA also agreed to produce recommendations for appropriate changes such as revised program activities, staffing and management changes, and changes in linkages with other agencies.

2. Key Informant Interviews

A.   Field Observations and Interviews with Key Informants

RDA conducted field observations and interviews with project directors and line staff to develop an understanding of the mission of each individual program component and to secure feedback about specific aspects of SafeFutures. To this end, RDA evaluators met with Probation officers and program managers, school principals and a HealthyStart director, a coordinator with Parks and Recreation and two police administrators, and staff and administrators of participating community-based agencies. Over the course of six weeks, RDA staff interviewed a total of thirty-four SafeFutures and partner agency staff. The interviews consisted of seven open-ended questions and each interview lasted from forty-five minutes to an hour.

B.   Summary of Responses from Individual Key Informant Interviews

The summary below generally follows the format of the interview. All people interviewed were asked the same series of questions and were very generous with their time and insights.

1.   *SafeFutures Objectives as Defined by the Key Informants*

Within the context of the **schools**, those interviewed identified improved grades, behavior**,** and test scores and improved student/adult relations and peer relations as primary objectives. They also noted that reduced truancy and increased ways that young people can take leadership roles in their communities are important objectives. Reduced behaviors and values that are contrary to school success were cited as another major objective. More involvement of primary caregivers and other community members as volunteers and tutors were seen as essential to moving toward reaching the overall SafeFutures goals.

Of the five school principals interviewed, most knew little or nothing of SafeFutures' goals and objectives. However, many were familiar with specific SafeFutures staff working at their school sites and welcomed their contributions to improving the quality of the school community. All school principals interviewed were interested in the SafeFutures concept and believed in the philosophy of the program. They felt that formal Memoranda of Understanding (MOU's) between SafeFutures and school representatives

---

[5] "A program logic model is a description of how the program theoretically works to achieve benefits for participants. It is the 'If-Then' sequence of changes that the program intends to set in motion through its inputs, activities, and outputs. Logic models are useful frameworks for examining outcomes. They help you think through the steps of participants' progress and develop a realistic picture of what your program can expect to accomplish for participants. They also help you identify the key program components that must be tracked to assess the program's effectiveness." (from *Measuring Program Outcomes: A Practical Approach,* United Way of America, 1996, page 38)

and on-going information-sharing about students would significantly help SafeFutures reach its objectives.

Among the **family objectives** described by key informants, increased parent/child communications and increased parent participation at community events and at school, especially in planning on their child's behalf and goal setting, were cited most frequently. Those interviewed also felt that youth need improved self-esteem, conflict resolution skills, and risk avoidance capacity. Many key informants highlighted as major objectives greater family access to community services and more resources to help families with basic needs. They also felt that families need better problem solving and parenting skills and more positive role models in their lives.

During the interviews, a number of **community objectives** emerged. Interviewees emphasized that, above all, students had to feel safe in their school and community. In relationship to this overarching objective, they said they are working hard for reducing risk factors overall, for reducing youth involvement in the juvenile justice system, and for decreasing youth gang involvement and their use of drugs and alcohol. The key informants also highlighted increased employment and training options as major objectives of SafeFutures work. Several respondents cited improving youth and adult leadership skills so that more community members can become advocates for youth in the community.

The key informants identified reduced gang and crime involvement as the major **Core Team objectives.** They see these as being reached most effectively by attaching youth to supportive institutions (school and employment) and by intensified law enforcement supervision.

2. *Youth Served by SafeFutures as Described by Key Informants*

When asked to provide a profile of the participating youth, every key informant focused on the deficit qualities of the youth involved in SafeFutures. All those interviewed described the youth and their family as follows:

> *The youth are between the ages of 5 and 21. They display poor academic performance and are involved with the juvenile justice system. They are truant, sexually acting out, and emotionally immature for their age. They have anger management issues, low self-esteem, lack of respect for authority, and lack of impulse control. They frequently display attention-getting behaviors. These youth are primarily from low income, multi-problem families, headed by single parents or grandparents who are unemployed or unskilled laborers. In the home there are often mental health issues, domestic violence or unrest, substance use or abuse, and unstable housing conditions.*

This may be an artifact of the way in which the interview questions were asked, the interview context, or the key informants' perceptions of the interviewers' expectations. For example, the key informants may have understood the question to be "What youth characteristics resulted in their referral to SafeFutures?" However, there are indications that the emphasis on deficits is pervasive. For example, after a key informant told one

interviewer that 30% of the youth in his program came from single parent families, she pointed out that that meant that 70% came from two-parent families.

It is troubling that twenty-six people involved in the program were unable to speak positively of the children and families in SafeFutures. Modern social work techniques all require that those providing services develop case plans based on personal and community assets of those being served as well as deficits.

The few positive descriptions of the young people were given to illustrate how well a program was working. For example, one key informant noted that none of the girls in one program had become pregnant as compared with girls not in the program. Others involved in the mentoring program components proudly stated that many youth participants chose to stay in the program longer than expected because they liked what the program gave them. For instance, the youth enjoyed going on outings, especially to the mentor's homes to see other ways the people live.

3. *Issues Faced by Youth in SafeFutures Programs as Described by Key Informants*

The thirty-four people interviewed listed many issues faced by youth in SafeFutures' programs, all of which are common in almost any low-income, multi-ethnic community in the country.

The **family**-related issues included:

- Family members are in unstable, low-wage jobs;

- Families face constant financial problems;

- Too many parents are on probation or in prison or jail;

- Families live in poor housing;

- Communication between parents and children is too often lacking;

- Few parents are aware of and involved in treatment planning for their child;

- Many family relationships are weak or non-existent;

- Domestic violence is too common;

- Many families are grappling with mental health problems, too many of which are untreated;

- Significant language and cultural barriers between parents and community resources contribute to isolation of families;

- Many parents have poor parenting skills and are not getting help to develop those skills. Similarly, the key informants identified **school** issues such as:

- Too many school facilities are dilapidated;

- There are not enough school counselors and Neighborhood Resource Specialists to meet the enormous needs of children and their parents;

- Truancy rates continue to be too high;

- Academic test scores continue to be low;

- Too few parents are aware of and involved in the school activities;

- Gang related activity adversely affects the school environment;

- Violence in the schools is too common;

- Too many teachers lack adequate classroom management skills; and

- The high turnover of school principals, teachers and other staff contributes to instability of the school community.

The list of **community** issues included:

- The crime rate and rate of serious crime continue to damage the quality of life;

- Unemployment rates continue at unacceptably high levels;

- Community resources are insufficient to meet the needs of the community;

- Job training opportunities are inadequate to meet the need;

- Culturally competent mental health services are insufficient to meet community needs;

- Persistent and recently escalating gang violence threatens every member of the community;

- Ongoing gang turf issues seriously undermine the quality of life in the community;

- Easy access to drugs and alcohol and persistent substance abuse hurts the community;

- The quality of housing for too many in the community is poor;

- Services available to the monolingual population are insufficient;

- Collaboration and coordination of existing community services is lacking;

- Hostility and lack of understanding between many ethnic groups hurts the community; and

- Language and cultural barriers to accessing services are overwhelming to too many residents.

4. *Key Informant Views of Resources Used by SafeFutures Programs & Resources Needed*

The key informants listed the following agencies and/or program as resources utilized by their agencies to meet SafeFutures goals and objectives (Several are SafeFutures partners, e.g. the Juvenile Probation Department):

- Familias Unidas,

- Coronado YMCA,

- Healthy Start,

- Juvenile Probation Department,

- Richmond Police Department,

- Battered Women's' Alternatives,

- Adult Education,

- West Contra Costa Unified School District

- County Office of Education,

- Faith institutions, and

- A variety of county services including health, welfare, and housing assistance.

In addition, some key informants questioned whether SafeFutures agencies are using these resources to the fullest extent possible.

Most key informants said that the community needs safe space for youth, safe havens that are free from gang turf issues. One of the most frequently cited **resources needed** was a teen center. Other resources recommended by key informants were:

- Establishing mobile mental health outreach to make sure that the neediest people have access to mental health services;

- More age-appropriate and culturally appropriate mentors;

- More relevant employment opportunities (recommended primarily by those involved in finding employment for SafeFutures participants);

- More counselors, case managers, and Neighborhood Resource Specialists (recommended primarily by those involved in front line jobs, as opposed to administrative positions); and

- Information about which components of SafeFutures work best and where the strengths and weaknesses of the SafeFutures programs lie.

   5. *How Key Informants View the Data Collection Process*

The Gang Outreach Workers, Neighborhood Resource Specialists (NRS), Probation officers, case managers, and program managers interviewed reported that SafeFutures uses the following data collection instruments in its school-based and street outreach work (The Summit Program, OAYRF, and the mentoring programs use data collection instruments that are unique to their programs.)

- Intake/Assessment Form ("long form"): This form is used for youth that come into

SafeFutures programs through the schools and the Core Team.[6] It is used to collect data about a youth's identity and demographics, plus a battery of over 80 questions about their household, school, employment, offspring, and "risk and resiliency factors". The same form is used during the periodic reassessment process, at 6 month intervals, if the youth client is still receiving services. Several versions of this form remain in use. Refinements to the forms have been made so that essential programmatic data might be captured accurately and consistently from the different service agencies. Each service agency uses a slightly different form. In some of the agencies, a specific reassessment form exists. It poses the screening questions in a slightly different way. (Most assessments — 1550 of 1800 — were conducted by staff persons at Youth Service Bureau and Juvenile Probation.

- Consent forms: Each agency has a form that parents or guardians read to learn about the agency and services that will be provided to the youth. The guardian's permission must be obtained so that the youth's case management data may be shared with the Urban Institute for the national evaluation. The guardian is clearly given the option to withhold permission. However, only 500 of the 1900 consent forms submitted to the SafeFutures Director's office indicate that consent for services was given.

- Short intake form: This form is used for youth that come into SafeFutures programs through street outreach workers. It includes about half of the assessment questions used on the full Intake Assessment/Reassessment form.

- Client Contact logs: These logs are used to collect data about direct services to a youth and his/her family. The logs serve also as a record of staff persons' time spent with or on behalf of clients and specify the type of services rendered. The YSB, OAYRF, and the mentoring programs have similar yet distinct paper forms for collecting the client contact information. This complicates efforts to insure consistency of data coding during data entry.

- Community mobilization logs: These logs are used to collect data about SafeFutures activities that involve engaging the broader community to reduce delinquency and prevent violence.

- Group attendance logs: Gang Outreach Workers and Neighborhood Resource Specialists submit write-ups of community meetings they organize, including agenda, minutes, and attendance. These youth workers also submit attendance lists for regularly scheduled group meetings and for one-time activities and excursions.

The youth workers are responsible for completing the above forms in a timely manner and sending them to the SafeFutures Director's office. The Gang Outreach Workers and Neighborhood Resource Specialists supervised by the Youth Services Bureau (YSB) submit all forms to Chuck Stephenson at YSB. Mr. Stephenson conducts a quantitative review of the total hours per month per staff person spent in direct client

---

[6] The Core Team involves probation officers from OAYRF, staff from Youthbuild and Opportunity West, the Gang Outreach Workers, and a Program Manager from Youth Service Bureau. No representatives from the WCCUSD, police department, or the Probation office for West Contra Costa County are part of the team.

services before forwarding these forms to the SafeFutures Director's office. Onna Alexander at YSB is responsible for a qualitative review of the managed cases and for providing the youth workers with supervision regarding their case plans.

Forms reflecting events and services in a given month are due to the Director's office by the 5th of the following month. All forms received at the SafeFutures Director's office are examined for completeness. Any incomplete forms received from YSB are returned to YSB. The Director's office is responsible for data entry.

At six-month intervals, queries are performed in the database in order to create a data set for the national SafeFutures evaluation conducted by the Urban Institute. UI provides feedback in the form of questions and comments. This feedback has revealed a number of flaws in the areas of data encoding and data validation. The SafeFutures Director's office, with assistance from the data entry contractor and from supervisors in the service agencies, responds to UI with explanations and/or with re-submissions of portions of the data set.

The youth workers as well as Youth Service Bureau staff report several major problems regarding data collection and processing. On numerous occasions, completed paper forms have been lost somewhere between the case workers and the SafeFutures Director's office. Forms must be photocopied anew and be re-submitted.

For some components of the SafeFutures project, some of the data that is requested on the common Assessment form is not age-appropriate. Inclusion of these questions on the data collection form gets in the way of gathering the other useful pieces of information about the youth being served.

Many key informants feel that there is too much data collection paperwork and the completion of it seriously limits the time staff could use to work with the youth. This view is linked to the frequent observation that there has never been any feedback from the data analysis. Absent this feedback, it it not surprising that many staff feel there is little purpose to all the data collection.

The youth workers and Youth Service Bureau staff suggested that the forms be redesigned so that they are more age-appropriate and more user friendly. Logical inconsistencies and ambiguities need to be corrected. Page formatting that groups questions together could be better used to help staff move more efficiently through the data collection process. For example, responses to some questions about a youth's status (e.g., not currently enrolled in school, not a teen parent, etc.) make the subsequent questions moot.

Several key informants suggested that data be maintained in a central location to reduce the loss of data and to facilitate data analysis and feedback based on that analysis. If computers can be provided, computer training will be needed to make sure that the equipment actually helps reduce the workload on line staff. Computer-based data collection instruments might incorporate logical "branching" so that the Assessment form or the Contact Log form, as presented on the computer screen, shows precisely those "user-friendly" characteristics that are lacking in the paper forms. Development and deployment of a single-service-agency version of the database at YSB might go as far as enabling youth workers — or at least their supervisors — to enter their own data and to

run their own caseload and service statistics reports. This would reduce the perceived paperwork burden and also deliver useful, immediate feedback from the service and assessment records.

6. *Key Informant Descriptions of the Process of Creating Treatment Plans*

Treatment plans are developed in different ways throughout the SafeFutures program network. In the **school-based SafeFutures programs,** the child's parent, the Neighborhood Resource Specialist, a representative from the school, and the child design the treatment plan together. In the **street outreach programs,** formal treatment plans are not developed. The rationale is that, since the youth in this program are older and are under no authority to participate, an informal relationship between the street outreach worker and youth is sufficient. Only a short intake form is completed in the street outreach program and it is completed after at least three contacts have been made (This is also described as "three interventions."). Probation Officers develop the treatment plans used by the Core Team. They have access to school and probation records. **YouthBuild** utilizes an application form that includes a review of school transcripts and information from collateral contacts. Treatment plans based on the application and the elements of each plan are clarified with input from the youth involved and any significant others.

3. Development of Logic Models

Between October 9th and December 31st 2000, RDA staff held three logic model sessions with administrators and staff of SafeFutures programs. In addition, a logic model for the mentoring programs was developed based on the interviews with the key informants that relate to those programs. The logic models are attached.

The **Summit Center** logic model session involved twelve supervisors, clinicians, and probation staff over a two-hour period. Participants first listed the main groups involved in the program: boys between 12 and 18 years of age; parents; Volunteers in Probation and staff of substance abuse treatment programs; the Probation Department; the County Office of Education; and the County Department of Mental Health as the lead agency. The key activities or strategies in which these groups are involved included:

- intake screening with family input and a commitment to cooperate;

- individual and family therapy;

- group sessions on issues such as cultural values and violence, victim empathy;

- a specialized education program within the school department;

- a student government group and community meetings; and

- outings (pro-social activities), a newspaper, computer training, and mentoring;

These activities or strategies were then linked to intermediate outcomes. For example, the outcomes of screening at the point of intake and therapy were defined as engagement of the family in wraparound services and parent involvement in program groups. The intermediate outcome attached to individual and family therapy was that a boy in the program would acknowledge that he had violated the law (violation acknowledgement) and this would lead to the youth being drug free and willing and able

to follow directions and rules. Ultimately, the program would help youth to become employed, law-abiding, and a contributing member of society.

The **School/Family/and Community** logic model session involved six staff members from that SafeFutures component over a two-hour period. As with the Summit Center process described above, participants identified the key groups involved in this aspect of SafeFutures as the following: elementary school students in West Contra Costa Unified School District; the broader community composed of the parents of these students, Kaiser Hospital, and Planned Parenthood; public agencies including the School District (Lincoln, Nystrom, and Coronado schools), law enforcement and the courts, the City of Richmond's Park and Recreation Department, and the County Mental Health and Social Services Departments; and the Youth Service Bureau as the lead agency. The key activities or strategies in which these groups are involved included:

- outreach, intake and assessment and developing a treatment plan;
- tutoring;
- individual and group counseling;
- conflict mediation;
- group social and recreational activities;
- community mobilization; and
- providing resource and referral information.

These activities or strategies were then linked to intermediate outcomes. For example, the tutoring outcomes were that the students would show greater interest in their lessons and in completing them. Based on these outcomes, students would improve their attendance, increase their attention spans, and improve their academic performance. Ultimately, this would lead to graduation and increased self-esteem.

The four-hour **Core Team/Aftercare** logic model session/retreat involved seventeen members of the team, including managers and staff from community-based organizations and the Probation Department. Participants identified the key groups involved in this aspect of SafeFutures as the following: members of the broader community (parents, Battered Women's Alternatives, Familias Unidas, YEES, local businesses, International Institute of the East Bay, and Opportunity West); public agencies including local, city and county law enforcement/ legal system; the City of Richmond (Adult School, Parks and Recreation Department, Employment and Training Services, and Public Works), the Contra Costa County mental health & social services departments, the West Contra Costa Unified School District, and the County Office of Education; and Youth Service Bureau as the lead agency. The key activities or strategies in which these groups are involved included:

- outreach, intake & assessment and providing information, resources, and referrals;
- early interventions such as peer conflict mediation and life skills workshops;
- more early interventions such as recreation and youth-initiated activities;

- intensive interventions such as probation supervision, counseling, and support groups;

- more intensive interventions such as resume writing and job searching.

These activities or strategies were then linked to intermediate outcomes. For example, the probation supervision, counseling, and support groups outcomes were linked to increased expectations, greater respect for authority figures, and sustained negative drug testing. The increased expectations outcome was linked to "reduce risk factors in youths' lives", and "youth adopt new belief systems". Ultimately, these activities and outcomes would lead to "youth becoming productive members of society," youth leading stable lifestyles with respect to their housing, employment, attitude, and being drug free, and the community becoming safer.

The **Mentoring** logic model was drawn from extensive interviews with adult participants in the SafeFutures mentoring programs. Participants identified the key groups involved in this aspect of SafeFutures as the following: youth (70 mentoring youth, ages 6-14, in MIND; 50 girls, ages 12-18, who are currently on probation in Step Up and Lead; 30 girls and boys, ages 12-18, in Volunteers In Probation); community members including parents, Kaiser Hospital, Planned Parenthood, and the Coronado YMCA; public agencies (local, city and county law enforcement/ legal system; County Mental Health & Social Services; Chris Adams and Summit Centers, Circle of Care day treatment centers for girls; County Office of Education; and Substance Abuse); and as the lead agencies, the Youth Services Bureau (MIND), Families First (Step Up and Lead), and Contra Costa County Probation Department (Volunteers in Probation). The key activities or strategies of each mentoring program is as follows:

- **MIND**: formal and informal counseling; individual and group recreation and social activities; educational and motivational events; one-on-one mentoring, exposure to higher idea; and work with the school site teams;

- **Step Up and Lead:** provide information, resources and referrals; establish and support positive relationships for young girls involved in the juvenile justice system; weekly one-on-one mentoring for a minimum of one year in such areas as educational/vocational skills, mental and physical health , self confidence and self esteem; outings, social events and activities; tutoring, counseling, vocational and literacy training

- **Volunteers in Probation:** one-on-one mentoring; assist-A-Probation Officer; tutoring and newsletter- based activities Juvenile Hall; internet mentoring; monthly meetings with speakers on such topics as drug use and younger girls dating older men; home Supervision; and Circle of Care

4. Results of the Qualitative Assessment

A.   Individual Program Achievement Highlights

The following highlights were drawn from the key informant interviews:

- None of the girls in SafeFutures programs got pregnant while in the programs.

- Community linkages are providing helpful opportunities for family members such as connecting them with outlets for free food during the holidays.

- Some gang members were able to get out of the gangs and into more successful activities.

- Some program participants return as program staff after finishing the program.

- Youth in mentoring programs are exposed to computer skills training that can help them get work in the future.

- Youth in the mentoring programs benefited from visiting mentors' homes because they were able to see how "successful" people live.

- Many of the SafeFutures program staff spend a lot of time working to bridge cultural gaps between youth.

- SafeFutures programs give many kids openings to meaningful work they can do to support their families, work that replaces drug dealing and other illegal activities.

- Even when a SafeFutures program participant is arrested, they often keep in touch with the community-based program they have been working with.

- Six program participants registered to vote.

- Youth in SafeFutures really enjoy doing new things with their time.

B.   Major Emerging Issues

Throughout the interviews, a genuine sense of concern for the SafeFutures young people and their families and a deep commitment to supporting and guiding them was evident. Key informants understand profoundly the horrible conditions faced by these youth and their families and the enormous challenges they need to overcome. Key informants also had a firm grasp of the challenges faced by the public and non-profit agencies that are working to change conditions and support youth and families. Six major issues emerged out of the process of developing logic models with the SafeFutures components described above:

- **Lack of communication and collaboration** between all agencies involved: Though there is evidence of reactive collaboration such as working together during crisis moments, there was little evidence of proactive collaboration.

- Lack of understanding of and agreement on use of the **Spergel Model**: This multi-strategy approach to reducing gang violence involves delivering five core strategies through an integrated and team-oriented problem-solving approach. Central to the gang suppression core strategy is that community-based agencies and local groups must collaborate with juvenile and criminal justice agencies in the surveillance and sharing of information under conditions that protect the community and the civil liberties of youth. This requires very high levels of trust and a shared philosophy and vision.

- **Lack of responsive, available local mental health services** for target population families: Many community-based agency and school staff see serious and persistent mental health problems among too many community residents and an inability on the part of those residents to secure mental health services for themselves. These community-based agency and school staff seem to lack the resources necessary to establish workable connections between those in the community who need mental health services and county mental health service providers. They identified barriers to treatment as culturally unresponsive county mental health services, inadequate outreach by mental health service, and service locations that are hard to find and/or get to.

- **Roles and responsibilities need clarification.** Responsibilities of all SafeFutures partners need to be well–defined and coordinated. Responsibilities of the Neighborhood Resource Specialists need to be specific and shared with the school staff.

- **Feedback is needed** on data analysis, the logic models and expert consultation.

C.   Recommendations

Based upon RDA's observations, interviews and review of the data, we are making the following preliminary recommendations

1. **Analyze data and provide feedback to staff:** There continue to be major problems with data collection and thus with the ability to adequately analyze the outcomes to this effort. Many of the people interviewed were interested in learning more about what the data has to say. To our knowledge there has been no regular feedback mechanism whereby service delivery people had the opportunity to reflect on the data and discuss what it was saying. Having the top managers of each of the programs regularly and consistently use the data in face-to-face sessions with staff teams should help to solve many of the problems of data collection. The opportunity to discuss the results of the data and to talk about what it means in light of service delivery should also help staff understand the importance of all of the paperwork that they are responsible for maintaining. Utilizing the data as a management tool to monitor how service delivery staff are spending their time would also reinforce the importance of data collection. Until these steps are taken it is doubtful that the quality of data collection will improve.

2. **Enhance the data management system**:

   •   Refine the forms and adjust for age-appropriateness, efficiency and ease of use;

   •   Increase clerical staff time to provide support for timely submission of data;

   •   Require that all case managers show evidence of providing at least 60% percent of their time in direct client contact;

   •   Establish quality assurance monitoring, utilizing anecdotal records as well as accumulated data analysis;

- Provide regular data feedback and analysis to staff to assist in effective program planning and quality service delivery

3. **Formalize and clarify case management standards:** Clarification about the goals and content of case management goals and role expectations. More clearly articulate the role of the Neighborhood Resource Specialists at the school sites and formalize their relationship. For SafeFutures School/Family/Community and CoreTeam components, the approach needs to be more clearly specified and grounded in the routine needs of youth and their families to enhance the likely impact of this intervention strategy.

4. **Renew and clarify MOU's with all the schools involved with SafeFutures: Our interview work revealed that the majority of school administrators are not familiar with Safe Futures as a program.** While they are appreciative of and familiar with particular staff people from Safe Futures, there is no acknowledgement of the broader goals and philosophy of the program. This understanding and buy-in is necessary to insure integration within the school community and to help insure the continuation of services beyond the grant period.

5. **Utilize other services and systems to meet the needs of youth.** It appears that once a youth is taken into a program they receive all of their services from that one program. In some cases, a caseworker should determine if there are additional services that a youth might need and make arrangements to insure that such services are obtained.

6. **Explore the reasons for the lack of adequate mental health service delivery for youth and work to overcome the problem.** As reported by service providers, Safe Futures participants are not accessing county mental health services. Given the multitude of problems faced by youth and their families and the described conditions of families and neighborhoods, it is assumed that many of these youth would benefit from mental health services.

7. **Make service delivery and the school site-based curricula (behavioral/anger management, conflict resolution, and life skills) provided by Youth Service Bureau staff consistent,** to the extent possible, while acknowledging the goals of SafeFutures and those of the school. This could be worked on as part of the Memoranda of Understanding process described above in recommendation #4.

8. **Define protocols for engagement between Safe Futures caseworkers and the staff and managers of the Probation Department and the high schools and middle schools.** There are continuing differences between representatives from community based organizations and representatives from the Probation and the police departments about information sharing and probation compliance, e.g. when to violate a youth on probation, what information that community agency staff have must be passed on to probation officers, etc. Though both groups share a deep concern for public safety, there appear to be significant differences regarding the mission of the effort and ways to improve public safety. It should

be noted, however, that level of mutual understanding and collaboration has improved over time, especially between Probation Officers and non-profit staff.

9. **Assume a vigorous partnership role to increase school success and commitment to academic achievement** through community-wide mobilization to support school success and academic achievement. This must be linked to tools and resources for schools and after school programs that will support improving language and math literacy.

Attachment II

SafeFutures Funding Analysis and Recommendations for Long Term Funding Strategies

---

I. INTRODUCTION

The SafeFutures long-term funding analysis is based on an assessment of the existing SafeFutures collaborative services, its overall goals and objectives, and the youth and family members served. The purpose of this analysis is to identify opportunities for funding past the 5th year of SafeFutures, highlight potential barriers, and to explore funding strategies.

SafeFutures is at a key juncture in its development as it completes it's final year of service delivery under the current funding source. The collaborative has received $1.4 million annually for the past four years from the U.S. Department of Justice's Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP). Contra Costa County's SafeFutures is one of six communities nationwide receiving this funding to reduce youth violence and delinquency by creating a continuum of care that is responsive to the needs of youth and their families. This coordinated approach of prevention, intervention and treatment is designed to incorporate both the juvenile justice and human services systems, including health, mental health, child welfare, education, police, probation, courts and corrections. During this fifth and final year of OJJDP funding, SafeFutures collaborative partners will be mapping out and beginning to implement a plan to secure ongoing support for the continuum of services developed over the past four years.

As a first step in mapping out a long-term funding plan, the SafeFutures partner agencies need to determine what SafeFutures will look like after the fifth year. There are three potential configurations, each with advantages and disadvantages for purposes of long-term funding:

1. Continuing as a Collaborative:

This configuration requires that the existing SafeFutures partners decide which agencies will continue with the collaborative and which will not. It also requires that the collaborative revisit its goals and objectives and confirm that commitment through Memoranda of Understanding.

Advantages:

- A collaborative structure allows members to pool resources to leverage new revenue. A larger group of agencies is more likely to create a larger pool of shared funds with which to leverage more revenue.

- A collaborative structure enhances the potential for systems change. It requires that the participating agencies develop a shared definition of how individuals and institutions change.

- Collaboratives are better able to develop a more efficient and effective service delivery system.

- Many time-limited and ongoing revenue sources are more likely to support an existing effective collaborative rather than individual agencies or new, unproven collaborative.

Disadvantages

- Successful collaborations are difficult to realize and maintain. There is question regarding the degree to which SafeFutures has succeeded in developing a strong and healthy collaboration.

- The process of revisiting goals and objectives takes time and money - resources that partner agencies may be unable or unwilling to expend.

2. Disbanding the Collaborative and Proceeding as Independent Agencies:

This configuration requires that participating agencies assess which specific services provided through SafeFutures should continue. SafeFutures agencies must also determine how the services that should continue can be optimally configured and financially supported. For example, Youth Services Bureau and the West Contra Costa Unified School District could pursue ongoing funding to expand the number of Neighborhood Resource Specialists working with students and their family members.

Advantages

- Disbanding the collaborative eliminates the need to designate the time and energy required to make the collaborative work.

- Individual agencies can be more flexible in seeking ongoing funding if they can operate on their own timeline and develop their own program designs.

- The political problems associated with dropping the ineffective components of SafeFutures do not have to be confronted.

Disadvantages

- The opportunity to create a large pool of shared resources with which to leverage funds is lost.

- The independent agencies cannot claim SafeFutures' collaborative track record.

- The potential for system change embodied in the collaborative process would be lost.[7]

---

[7] *Collaboratives benefit from the enhanced decision-making that results from teamwork. Since decisions are based on an appraisal process or theory of change, in order for a collaborative to successfully make decisions it is necessary for the team to develop a shared theory of change that is a composite of the approaches that characterize the agencies that form the collaborative. Absent developing a shared theory of change, members of the collaborative team may experience tension, hesitation, and uneasiness attributable to the fundamental differences underlying their respective decision-making processes….The benefit of collaboration is that by working together the product of the whole is greater than the sum of the parts. The development of a cross agency theory of change unifies the operational practices of the partners and facilitates the development of a service delivery system that uses collaboration to enhance effectiveness and efficiencies.* (from "The Need for a Collaborative Theory of Change in a Multi-Disciplinary Program ," Todd Sosna, PhD, Former Assistant Director, Santa Barbara County Department of Mental Health, produced by the Cathie Wright Technical Assistance Center, 2030 J Street, Sacramento CA, 95814)

3. **Securing Funding to continue the array of services with or without current service providers:**

This strategy will require some political courage and may at first prove unpopular from the SafeFutures service provider community. If Contra Costa County determines that the services delivered under Safe Futures during the past 4.5 years are worthwhile, then funding from a variety of sources, including local mental health and probation might be made available to continue such services. However, it is not necessarily the case that the current service providers be the organizations to continue to provide the services.

Some of the existing service providers may not have the capacity to continue services past the Federal funding period. Others may not wish to continue. Still other may be judged to have not done a satisfactory job under the current funding source. If Contra Costa County makes a commitment to continue the services, they can chose to RFP the services and either award current providers or find new providers. Either way, the issue of identifying appropriate resources remains a key issue.

II. Opportunities for and Barriers to Long-Term Funding

The potential for finding revenue to support the SafeFutures programs over the long-term is excellent. Four primary factors contribute to that potential:

1. Many revenue sources available to support programs focused on reducing youth violence and delinquency. Those are outlined below.

2. The SafeFutures' emphasis on prevention fits well with the growing consensus that investments in delinquency prevention can substantially reduce the risk of a vulnerable child's long-term dependence on public services.

3. SafeFutures' public partners currently expend funds that could be used to draw down new federal funds. The funds that these new federal reimbursements would replace could be used as building blocks for SafeFutures' increasingly integrated service delivery system.

4. SafeFutures' developing focus on the role of parents in reducing children's involvement in the juvenile justice system increases the potential to use CalWorks as a funding source for supportive services needed by families.

The challenges to securing ongoing support for SafeFutures are formidable, but not impossible to overcome. These barriers are as follows:

1. Each program involved in the SafeFutures collaborative delivers a different type of service to a portion of the targeted population. These services range from clinically based institutional programs such as the Summit Program to volunteer based one-to-one mentoring. While the breath and scope of the different modalities of services is a strength of the program, it is unlikely that one funding source will fund all types of services. This situation requires that the collaborative piece together funding from a variety of sources based on the characteristics of the populations that qualify for those funds.

2. Many of the most promising funding sources available for continuing some of the SafeFutures' program components will require changes in the ways in which

some of the current organizations undertake their work. For example, organizations that develop service plans based only on the client's deficits will have to change this practice if they seek ongoing funding from the federal Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Agency (SAMHSA) or from the state CalWorks. Similarly, community-based agencies that cannot secure county mental health assessments for the youth and/or family members they work with, will be unable to access funds for treatment services through EPSDT (Medi-Cal funds for mental health treatment of persons under 21.

3. For many of the SafeFutures organizations, monthly data collection has remained a problem. Many of the funding sources described below will require a more vigorous attention to data collection. Data collection systems that are not fully utilized will result in an inability to maximize funding sources and may result in fiscal insolvency of a program.

III.   Revenue Sources For SafeFutures Services

The public and private sector agencies that comprise SafeFutures each deliver different types of services. Depending on the type of service provided and an agency's capacity to demonstrate improved outcomes, each agency or organization may be able to draw on specific revenue sources. For example:

❖ If a program reduces child abuse, funding that currently supports child protective services—such as the Child Welfare Block Grant and Title IV-E—could be considered.

❖ If the program reduces emergency room and other medical costs, public health indigent funding, tobacco settlement funds, and maternal and child health funds could be considered.

❖ If emotional disturbance is reduced, mental health funding, including children's system of care funding and state realignment, could be considered.

❖ If substance abuse is reduced, then federal and state alcohol and drug funds could be considered.

❖ If school failure is reduced, school attendance increased and the need for special education services particularly for serious emotional disturbance decreased, school (daily attendance) and special education (SELPA) funds could be considered.

❖ If juvenile crime is reduced, probation funds (mostly county general fund) could be considered.

❖ If out-of-home placements of children secondary to juvenile crime are reduced, savings in the county share of group home costs and SB 163 could be considered.

❖ If parents are able to obtain employment due to a decrease in juvenile delinquency and related difficulties, Cal-WORKS and TANF could be considered.[8]

---

[8] Adapted from an analysis prepared by Todd Sosna, PhD, in the *Integrated Children's Services Fu*nding e-letter of March 28, 2000 distributed by the California Institute for Mental Health (www.cimh.org)

The potential sources of ongoing revenue available to SafeFutures partner agencies to continue to serve the SafeFutures population fall into a variety of different funding pools, each with different restrictions, different levels of local match, and different eligibility requirements. Many serve overlapping populations. All of these sources are already being accessed at some level by Contra Costa County, and many have some level of interagency blended funding activity already underway. Major categories of potential resources are as follows[9]:

1. *Federal Social Security Act funds (Title IV-E)*: These are federal dollars that flow from the federal government through the states to the counties. These funds are directed primarily at working with children in out-of-home placement or likely to be placed out-of-home and their parents. These funds are available on the county level primarily to the Department of Social Services, the Probation Department, and, through contracts, to non-profit community-based agencies.

2. *Federal Medicaid funds (Medi-Cal Title XIX):* These are federal dollars that also flow from the federal government through the states to the counties. These funds are available to public and private agencies that are certified for reimbursement. EPSDT, a funding stream for Medi-Cal eligible youth who are seriously emotionally disturbed, does not require local matching funds.

3. *State Healthy Families and STOP:* These funds are from California's General Fund budget and are intended to support health services for people that are not eligible for Medi-Cal.

4. *Federal and State Mental Health Funds:* These are federal and state funds available to counties to serve all children diagnosed as "seriously emotionally disturbed" and their family members.

5. *Federal Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF):* These are federal dollars that flow through the states to the counties to provide emergency assistance to families with limited or non-existent financial resources. Services include respite care, mental health assessment and counseling, and welfare-to-work services through CalWorks.

6. *Workforce Investment Act (WIA) Funds:* WIA reforms Federal job training programs and creates a new, comprehensive workforce investment system. The reformed system is intended to be customer-focused, to help Americans access the tools they need to manage their careers through information and high quality services and to help U.S. companies find skilled workers. One of the key principles is to improve youth programs and link them more closely to local labor market needs and community youth programs and services. WIA emphasizes maintaining a strong connection between academic and occupational learning. Youth programs include activities that promote youth development and citizenship, such as leadership development through voluntary community service opportunities; adult mentoring and follow up; targeted opportunity for youth living in high poverty areas.

---

[9] Time-limited funding sources such as large private foundations and government grant programs are not included.

7. *State Department of Education:* County schools receive state funding to educate children who are not in local schools for a variety of reasons and, as part of that process, to fund probation officers to provide direct support and services. Public education funds are reimbursed to local entities based on average daily attendance. In addition, school districts and Special Education Local Planning Areas receive funding to support special education services and support. Mental health services are also available to mentally disabled special education students.

8. *Federal Social Security Act, Title IV-E Waiver Projects*: Counties that are implementing a Title IV-E Waiver project may use Title IV-E Federal Financial Participation (FFP), foster care allocation and county funds (social services realignment and county general funds) flexibly to provide services to children and their families. For example, probation departments in participating counties may partner with social services to use Title IV-E funds for flexible services provided by probation staff, designed to reduce out-of-home placements and/or divert children in placement to less restrictive, more stable and permanent, family settings. As with other federal Title IV-E funding, participating counties must time study activities.

9. *Kinship Support Services Program:* The State Department t of Social Services allocated state funds, made available through Assembly Bill 1193 (Chapter 794, Statutes of 1997), to eight counties to implement new or expand existing Kinship Support Services Programs. Kinship Support Services Programs provide community-based family support services to relative caregivers and the children placed in their homes by the juvenile court and to those who are at risk of dependency or delinquency. The Kinship Support Services Programs also provide post-permanency services to relative caregivers that have become the legal guardians or adoptive parents of formerly dependent children. Contra Costa County was one of eight counties that received funding for the first year of this program.

10. *Title IV-E Probation:* The Fiscal Year 1991-92 [California] Budget Act provided for the statewide implementation of a process to pass through Title IV-E federal funds to county probation departments for administrative costs associated with wards placed in foster care. Administrative activities include the following services that are listed in 45CFR1356.60(c):

- The determination and re-determination of eligibility

- Fair hearings and appeals

- Referral to services

- Preparation for and participation in judicial determinations

- Placement of the child

- Development of the case plan

- Case review

- Case management and supervision

- Recruitment and licensing of foster homes and institutions

- Rate setting

- A proportionate share of related agency overhead

- Costs related to data collection and reporting

The child served must be a reasonable candidate for Title IV-E foster care maintenance payments but need not be placed in Foster Care.

11. *Federal Medicaid through State Medi-Cal (Title XIX):* Federal Medicaid provides a funding opportunity for a limited target population of Medi-Cal eligible youth among probation, child welfare, and SED populations. Potential staff funding for administrative purposes can include probation, child welfare services and mental health administrative staff. However, it is common for county probation departments to develop an MOU with the county department of social services to administer Medi-Cal. Reimbursement from DSS is based upon the time study of eligible activities. Examples of activities covered for administrative claiming include:

- Assisting those who are eligible in identifying and understanding health care needs and assisting in accessing medical services

- Determining and documenting Medi-Cal eligibility

- Referrals for assessment, evaluation, treatment of health-related needs

- Assistance to providing health services

- Interagency coordination and provider liaison to improve service delivery system

- Providing assistance to access services

- Development, implementation and management of health-related plans

- Minors in juvenile detention centers for criminal activity are eligible for reimbursement for specified activities after [or before; see note below] disposition.10 As with 300 WIC

12. *Medi-Cal Targeted Case Management:* The State Department of Health Services received federal approval for an amendment to the State Medi-Cal Plan that gives local governments the ability to claim reimbursement for case management services furnished to adults on probation. As with Title IV-E, there is a matching non-federal requirement for TCM. It is approximately 49%. TCM includes assessment and service planning development and review, as well as linkage, coordination, and crisis assistance planning. It is logical to assume that assessment of the family and its members would include a comprehensive risk assessment

13. *Medi-Cal Administrative Activities (MAA):* Community-based organizations that provide information to individuals about the Medi-Cal program and the services it covers (medical, mental health, substance abuse, etc.) have the potential to be

---

[10] As of December 1999 numerous HCFA regulations are recommended for change including a switch from post-dispositional to pre-dispositional eligibility for minors in juvenile detention facilities. This calls for close monitoring by probation departments currently participating as well as those who plan to begin administrative claiming.

reimbursed for the costs of these activities through the Department of Public Health, the local agency responsible for administering the MAA program. MAA also provides reimbursement for activities that help individuals enroll in the Medi-Cal program, arranging for or providing transportation to Medi-Cal covered services, and for program planning and policy development around services that are covered by Medi-Cal.

14. *EPSDT in Children's Mental Health:* An analysis of the potential revenue sources for SafeFutures needs to include the recent inclusion of EPSDT services in the children's mental health program. EPSDT is significant in that it enables Contra Costa County to expand mental health services to children under 21 who are on Medi-Cal and who have been determined to be eligible for the "full scope" of Medi-Cal benefits.

EPSDT is particularly significant as a revenue source because it does not require county realignment funds to be used for the non-federal share of the cost, as is required in other Medi-Cal mental health programs. EPSDT mental health services are the result of a lawsuit against the State Department of Health Services. As a result, the state, rather than the county, contributes the non-federal share of the cost. Medi-Cal.

15. *California Supportive and Therapeutic Options Program (STOP):* The Supportive and Therapeutic Options Program provides therapeutic and support services to children who are not eligible for, or cannot access needed services through Medi-Cal or other existing funding sources. Its primary purpose is to prevent out-of-home placements and facilitate and support successful transitions home and back into the community. The CDSS goal is for counties to provide family-centered, community-based services, including after care services that assure continuity of service delivery by maintaining already established relationships. STOP services may include, but are not limited to:

- Individual, group and family counseling

- Crisis response

- Educational and recreational services

- Vocational skills training

- Anger management

- Respite care

- Tutoring

- Day treatment

- Job counseling

- Parent education

County welfare departments may use their State General Fund STOP allocation to fund seventy percent of the total costs to provide these services. The remaining

thirty- percent of total costs is financed with county funds (e.g. social service realignment or county general funds).

16. *Federal TANF Probation:* The federal government enacted the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) program in September of 1997. The TANF program created a block grant to replace the former Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) entitlement program. The state of California now receives a general block grant that it may use in any manner that is reasonably calculated to achieve the goals of the TANF legislation. This block grant contains $149.877 million dollars as a result of the Title IV-A funds probation departments claimed through the Emergency Assistance Probation program that operated from July 1, 1993 through December 31, 1995. The legislature chose to allocate those TANF funds to county probation departments to implement the comprehensive Youth Serves Act (Chapter 270, Statutes of 1997).

County probation departments may use these funds to deliver "old program" services, "new program" services, and administrative services. The "old program" refers to the former Title IV-A Emergency Assistance Probation program and includes services such as payment for shelter care in juvenile assessment centers. These services must be delivered to children who meet the former Title IV-A Emergency Assistance Probation eligibility requirements. The "new program" refers to the Comprehensive Youth Services Act and includes services such as respite care and mental health assessment and counseling. Administrative costs shall not exceed fifteen percent of their total TANF probation allocation.

17. *CALWORKS:* Another possibility for funding SafeFutures grants is also related to CalWorks. A child may be able to receive services or supports, if they have a parent eligible for CalWORKs, to the extent that the services or supports advance the parent achieving their welfare-to-work goals. Services and supports can include collection of child support, Cal-Learn, substance abuse treatment, mental health treatment, child-care, transportation and other ancillary supports. The local Social Services Department administers CalWorks. Access to these services for children of an adult on probation and eligible for CalWorks could be facilitated by establishing a formal collaborative agreement between the probation and social services departments for the mutual provision of comprehensive, family-focused services and supports.

The Welfare-to-work funds are targeted at individuals who meet a number of criteria – youth aged 18-25 coming out of foster care, individuals with characteristics of long term dependence on public assistance, etc. They can be used for supportive services, and can be contracted out.

18. *Mental Health Services For Special Education Pupils' Program (AB 2726):* Children who exhibit a mental health disorder that impairs their ability to benefit from the regular education curriculum are eligible for mental health services as part of their special education services. The Mental Health Services for Special Education Pupils' Program provides funding for services for children referred to county mental health through their Individual Education Plan (IEP) and are determined to require mental health services to benefit from a free and appropriated public education. The services

provided by county mental health are part of the child's IEP and need to help the child to benefit from their education.

19. *Community Development Block Grants:* Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) are fixed, formula-based allocations that flow to the states from the federal government and then to the counties. Contra Costa County's CDBG might fund the administrative and case management resources that would permit community networks to provide services in a new and more rigorous way. As with CalWorks, the CDBG has current funding priorities. Discussions with the individuals who plan and oversee the disbursement of the grant might be helpful in determining whether any portion of SafeFutures services could be funded through CDBG.

IV. FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

As the SafeFutures partners consider the long-term funding options presented above, it is essential that they are clear about the service delivery system and the goals they are trying to achieve. Efforts to seek funding can at times lure agencies into implementing a successive series of structural and program changes independent of their service delivery model in order to qualify for additional funding. While seeking funding in this manner, organizations may be pulled from their primary mission, and program effectiveness may inadvertently take a back seat to revenue maximization.

Secondly, the SafeFutures partners should include both program and fiscal staff when developing collaborative programs and collaborative funding strategies. Fiscal staff is better prepared to implement creative and flexible funding strategies if they fully understand the program goals and activities. Alternatively, program staff is better able to design non-redundant strategies for claiming from varied sources if they fully understand the fiscal requirements. Collaboration needs to occur within agencies between fiscal and program staff in addition to occurring across agencies.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. A written plan to fund the array of Safe Futures services should be put in place. The plan should draw from the above list of potential resources as well as other sources. The plan should estimate the true costs of operating services as well as provide funding for capacity building of community-based organizations and the costs associated with building and sustaining the collaborative.

2. A decision should be made regarding who will act as the lead county institution or organization to spearhead this effort.

3. Budgeting for and obtaining resources for capacity building of organizations involved in delivering services will enhance all future efforts.

4. The fiscal plan should take into account the MIS needs of community organizations involved so that future data collection and ongoing outcome measurement can be included in the operations of all service providers.