

**SEATTLE TEAM FOR YOUTH/
MINORITY OUTREACH PROJECT**

OUTCOME EVALUATION REPORT:

**WHAT HAS CHANGED FOR
PARTICIPATING YOUTH AND FAMILIES?**

By

Barbara Gurley

Strengthening Services Using Outcomes

March 2, 2003

SEATTLE TEAM FOR YOUTH/
MINORITY OUTREACH PROGRAM

OUTCOME EVALUATION REPORT
WHAT HAS CHANGED FOR PARTICIPATING YOUTH AND FAMILIES?

March 2, 2003

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
INTRODUCTION	5
▪ Process Evaluation	6
▪ Outcome Evaluation	7
OUTCOME EVALUATION DESIGN	7
▪ Participatory Process	7
▪ Outcomes and Indicators	7
▪ Measurement Tools	9
➤ Juvenile Justice Records	9
➤ School District Records	9
➤ Client Goal Plans	10
▪ Sample Size	11
▪ Statistical Analyses Conducted	11
DETERMINING IF BIAS EXISTS WITH THE STUDY GROUP	12
RISK LEVEL OF YOUTH PARTICIPATING	14

RESULTS/TRENDS BASED ON FREQUENCIES AND AVERAGES AT 3 AND 6 MONTHS	15
▪ For all Outcomes Combined	16
▪ For Each Outcome Category	17
▪ For Each Indicator Within Each Outcome Category	18
➤ Reduce Gang Involvement/Criminal Behavior	18
❖ Juvenile Justice Records	18
❖ Client Goal Plans	26
➤ Increase Involvement In Educational Activities	27
❖ School District Records	27
❖ Client Goal Plans	32
 FACTORS INFLUENCING RESULTS	 33
▪ Impact of Demographics Factors on Outcomes	33
➤ Gender	33
➤ Age	35
➤ Ethnicity	37
▪ Impact of Intake Assessment Scores on Outcomes	39
 YOUTH NOT MAKING PROGRESS	 43
 IMPLICATIONS	 45
 RECOMMENDATIONS	 47
 CONCLUSIONS	 48

SEATTLE TEAM FOR YOUTH/MINORITY OUTREACH PROGRAM

OUTCOME EVALUATION REPORT

WHAT HAS CHANGED FOR PARTICIPATING YOUTH AND FAMILIES?

March 2, 2003

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Seattle Team for Youth/Minority Outreach Program (STFY/MOP) is a collaborative effort between the City of Seattle Human Services Department, the Seattle Police Department, and eleven (11) community-based social service agencies. In existence since the late 1980's, STFY/MOP provides case management and direct services city wide to gang involved and at-risk youth ages 11-24. In addition to case management, other services provided by STFY/MOP include employment assistance, leadership development, tutoring and mentoring, and recreation programs.

The case management model that STFY/MOP uses is similar to the Coordinated Services Model evaluated by the Washington State Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP). WSIPP determined that the Coordinated Services Model was successful connecting youth and families with community agencies resulting in reduced criminal offenses. The program WSIPP evaluated paid for itself within 2 years avoiding \$2,900 in juvenile justice costs per youth.

STFY/MOP wanted to determine if their results were similar to those obtained by the Coordinated Services Model. To do this, three types of data were reviewed: Juvenile justice records, school district records and client goal plans. At this time, data is available for only 6 months of participation in the program. The results are described below.

Youth Participating and Accuracy of Data

- The youth who gave permission to be included in the study were similar demographically to those who declined to participate.
- The majority (94.4%) of the youth in the program were assessed at moderate to high risk for 10 risk factors. 39.6% had known criminal activity, 30.3% were not enrolled in school and 40.7% of those enrolled were not attending regularly.

- The outcome results obtained were consistent among the 3 types of measurement tools: juvenile justice records, school district records and client goal plans.

Results

The results indicate the following:

- The majority of the youth were making positive progress towards the program's intended outcomes.
- There is significant positive change for attendance, GPA, school discipline referrals, school suspensions, felony referrals, total referrals, severity of referrals, convictions, and admissions to detention.
- The majority of the youth were making a lot or some progress on action steps on their client goals plans with particular success with the outcomes: increase involvement with educational activities, obtain/maintain basic needs, increase constructive use of time, and seek employment/vocational opportunities.
- The majority of the youth had reductions in criminal activity and severity of criminal activity during the first 6 months of enrollment in STFY. A longer time period is needed to confirm these trends and see if further improvement occurs.
- The majority of the youth improved their attendance and GPA and reduced school discipline referrals and suspensions during the first 6 months in STFY. A longer time period is needed to confirm these trends and see if further improvement occurs.
- Demographic factors such as gender, age and ethnicity influenced the youth outcomes.
 - There was some variation by gender. Overall, the majority of both genders had a decrease in criminal activity. There were fewer females with criminal activity. Of the youth with criminal activity, there were more females with increases in total referrals, while there were more males with decreases in total referrals. Both had a high percentage of decreases in felony referrals. Males had a higher percentage of increases in severity in referrals, while females had a higher percentage of increases in admissions to detention. While there were fewer females with criminal activity, they were making slightly less progress on their action steps on goal plans.
 - There was some variation by age. Overall, there was more criminal activity with 15 and 16 year olds. Youth age 14 and 15 had the largest decreases in criminal activity. Older youth made more progress on the action steps on goal plans.

- There was some variation by different ethnic groups. Asians had a higher percentage of youth with an increase in total referrals, yet the severity of referrals had the largest decrease. African-Americans and white had a larger decrease in total referrals, but the severity of referrals had a bigger increase.
- Intake risk factors also influence outcomes. For all outcomes combined, youth with moderate and high total intake risk scores both had high levels of progress on the action steps on their client goal plans. Youth with moderate risk scores (indicating a willingness to address the issues) had a higher percentage of a lot of progress.
- There is a small group of youth that are not making progress on: action steps on their client goal plan to reduce criminal activity and improve school performance. These youth shared some common characteristics: high total risk factor scores, unwillingness to acknowledge risk factors in their lives, males with previous felony referrals and detentions, and younger youth.
- There is a small group of youth not making progress on client goal plans. They had a slightly higher number of action steps related to mental health issues and basic needs.
- Outcomes that have lower levels of progress overall were: improve family functioning, address mental health issues, and reduce substance use/abuse. These are typically harder to address and take longer than 3-6 months to make progress on.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Celebrate the positive successes the youth and families are making in the STFY/MOP program. Best practices include celebrations to provide motivation for further progress.
2. Continue using the goal plan tool and gathering school district records and juvenile justice records. Consistent tools and information must be gathered to determine whether youth are meeting the program's intended outcomes.
3. Repeat this analysis with data over a longer time period. This is necessary to determine if these initial positive results continue over time. It will also help identify patterns that lead to success for youth facing different issues, and how much time it takes for them to be successful.
4. Determine if changes over a longer period of time are statistically significant also. The STFY/MOP program can then demonstrate that the changes are not due just to chance alone.
5. Identify factors that influence success over time. This is important information for best practices so case managers learn

- what types of action plans work best with different youth characteristics.
6. Identify factors that are barriers to success over time. This is important information for best practices so case managers learn how to help youth overcome these barriers and hopefully, avoid them before they occur.
 7. Discuss how case managers can address these factors in their day-to-day work and what types of training would be useful. This discussion is critical to continue the successes of some youth and increase the successes of youth who are struggling still.

Conclusions

Even after three to six months of participation, the majority of the STFY/MOP youth are making positive progress toward the program's intended outcomes. Criminal activity and school performance have had some significant change. This is a positive trend given such a short period of time and the high level of risk factors present in these youth's lives.

Further analysis is needed to determine if this trend continues and what patterns of change occur over a longer period of time so that the program can learn what type of intensity and duration is necessary for different youth participating in the program.

SEATTLE TEAM FOR YOUTH/MINORITY OUTREACH PROGRAM

OUTCOME EVALUATION REPORT

WHAT HAS CHANGED FOR PARTICIPATING YOUTH AND FAMILIES?

March 2, 2003

INTRODUCTION:

The Seattle Team for Youth/Minority Outreach Program (STFY/MOP) is a collaborative effort between the City of Seattle Human Services Department, the Seattle Police Department, and eleven (11) community-based social service agencies. In existence since the late 1980's, STFY/MOP provides case management and direct services city wide to gang involved and at-risk youth ages 11-24. In addition to case management, other services provided by STFY/MOP include employment assistance, leadership development, tutoring and mentoring, and recreation programs.

The case management model that STFY/MOP uses is similar to the Coordinated Services Model evaluated by the Washington State Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP). WSIPP determined that the Coordinated Services Model was successful connecting youth and families with community agencies resulting in reduced criminal offenses. The program WSIPP evaluated paid for itself within 2 years avoiding \$2,900 in juvenile justice costs per youth.

STFY wanted to determine if the results obtained by the Coordinated Services Model were also being achieved by their case management program. In February 2001, the City of Seattle Human Services Department (HSD) hired Barbara Gurley and Associates to conduct an evaluation of the Seattle Team for Youth/Minority Outreach Program. Two types of evaluation were conducted:

- Process Evaluation - to determine how the program is working
- Outcome Evaluation - to determine what has changed for participating youth and families

Process Evaluation:

The process report examined how the STFY/MOP program is working. Brief highlights from the process evaluation are provided below. For more detail, see the full report released during November, 2002.

The process evaluation was based on interviews and focus groups with 89 stakeholders - including participating and partner agencies, the Human Services Department, and youth and parents receiving services. Based on the feedback from these stakeholders, the Seattle Team for Youth/Minority Outreach Program is achieving considerable success in three key areas: Meeting Youth and Family Needs, Building Community Partnerships and Ensuring Quality of Services and Processes

Meeting Youth and Family Needs: Case managers are able to establish effective, respectful, and trusting relationships with the young people on their caseloads. Youth and their families receive culturally appropriate services that are tailored to their specific needs and situations. As a result of their participation in the STFY/MOP program, young people and their parents report a variety of positive changes in their lives, including increased academic success, reduced criminal or delinquent behavior, and a greater sense of empowerment both as parents and teens.

Building Community Partnerships: The program also has a positive impact in areas beyond direct services to youth and families. It has resulted in stronger relationships between the Seattle Police Department and the participating agencies, relationships that enhance the success of agency programs other than STFY/MOP as well. It has contributed to stronger relationships among agencies themselves, as case managers collaborate and provide support to each other in their work with youth.

Ensuring Quality of Services and Processes: Overall, stakeholders agree that the STFY/MOP program is implementing high quality case management services. However, there are some challenges that need to be addressed in order to sustain the program's success. Some of these challenges are related to services, and include clarifying the program's target population, supporting case managers, strengthening the referral process, and addressing the systemic barriers to implementing a collaborative case management program model. Other challenges are related to organizational and process issues such as decision-making, roles and responsibilities, and communication. As all of these challenges are addressed and resolved, a greater amount of energy and resources will become available to focus on continuing to provide excellent collaborative case management services to youth and their families.

OUTCOME EVALUATION:

The process report examined how the program is working – does the STFY/MOP program meet youth and family needs, build community partnerships, and ensure quality of services and processes? The outcome evaluation examines what has changed for participating youth and families – have youth reduced gang/criminal activity and increased their involvement with educational activities? Have families improved their functioning? This report describes the extent to which program participants are achieving specific outcomes.

OUTCOME EVALUATION DESIGN

PARTICIPATORY PROCESS

The outcome evaluation was developed with the input of case managers, supervisors, agency directors and City of Seattle Human Services Department staff. This group first worked together to clarify and define a list of intended program outcomes and realistic indicators for those outcomes, given the program’s client population.

OUTCOMES AND INDICATORS

The identified program outcomes and the indicators related to each outcome are listed in the following table.

Outcome	Indicators
Reduce Gang Involvement/Criminal Behavior	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Comply with probation orders▪ Comply with truancy orders▪ Pay restitution▪ Fulfill community service requirements▪ Take care of warrants▪ Reduce criminal activity▪ Comply with trespassing orders▪ Reduce illegal aggressive behavior▪ Avoid tagging on public/private property

Outcome	Indicators
Increase Involvement in Educational Activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Enroll in middle/high school or GED program ▪ Attend school regularly ▪ Improve school performance ▪ Improve school behavior ▪ Complete high school or equivalency ▪ Enroll in college or vocational program
Obtain/Maintain Basic Needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Acquire stable housing ▪ Get needed food ▪ Get needed clothing ▪ Get medical/dental care ▪ Find transportation ▪ Find source of income
Improve Family Functioning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Client and family negotiate rules ▪ Resolve family conflicts positively ▪ Communicate with each other ▪ Spend fun time together ▪ Seek outside supports ▪ Change daily family activities
Increase Social Competencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Deal with conflicts positively ▪ Resist negative pressure from friends ▪ Use planning and decision making skills ▪ Spend time with positive peers ▪ Respect your own culture/others ▪ Develop/expand positive attitudes towards self, school, family and life
Promote Personal Wellness/Positive Self Identity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Make plans for future ▪ Deal with stress in healthy ways
Increase Constructive Use of Time	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Participate in activities that encourage personal growth or learning ▪ Participate in community service
Seek Employment Vocational Opportunities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identify career path/vocational choices ▪ Participate in training program ▪ Conduct job search ▪ Obtain a job ▪ Maintain a job/resolve issues at job site
Address Mental Health Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Learn about mental health treatment options ▪ Choose a provider ▪ Make active use of mental health treatment

Outcome	Indicators
Reduce Substance Use/Abuse	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Learn about substance abuse treatment options ▪ Choose a treatment option ▪ Make active use of substance abuse treatment ▪ Get other supports

MEASUREMENT TOOLS

Next, the group considered various options for tools to measure progress toward outcomes.

The choice was made to use three types of measurement tools:

1. Juvenile Justice Records
2. School District Records
3. Client Goal Plans

Three types of measurement tools were chosen to provide multiple sources of information about the youth. This provides a more accurate picture of youth progress, and avoids biases that may be inherent with any particular tool.

Juvenile Justice Records

Superior Court was provided with a list of STFY/MOP youth names with anonymous ID numbers. Superior Court then provided program administrators a list of these anonymous ID numbers with criminal history information on referrals, convictions, admissions and detention days for the youth represented by each ID number.

School District Records

The Seattle School District was provided with a list of STFY/MOP youth names with anonymous ID numbers. The School District then provided program administrators a list of these anonymous ID numbers with information on attendance, grades and discipline referrals for the youth represented by each ID number.

Client Goal Plans

Client goals plans were chosen as the measurement tool for staff because goal plans are considered a best practice for case management. Goal plans also provide useful information to case managers when working day-to-day with youth. The tool provides useful outcomes evaluation information to track the progress being made, the factors influencing progress, and a way to identify trends with those youth not making progress.

As each young person enters the STFY/MOP program, a case manager conducts an intake assessment to determine what needs the youth has for each of the program's outcome areas (i.e. Reduce Gang/Criminal Activity). Then the case manager and the youth identify indicators (i.e., Comply with Probation Requirements) that will help the youth achieve these outcomes. Most youth have too many issues to be addressed all at once. So the case manager and youth determine what the priority outcomes and indicators should be for each quarter. Then for each priority, a set of detailed, concrete action steps (i.e., follow court orders, go to court dates, check in with JPC) are created for the youth.

To assure consistency among all the agencies participating in the STFY/MOP program, case managers and supervisors created a standard list of outcomes/indicators/action. This assured that the evaluators had common data elements to analyze across participating agencies. The complete list of action steps for these outcomes and indicators is lengthy so is not included in this report. The development of this list of action steps took 8 months to complete. It was considered important to invest this time in the design phase to assure accuracy of data and to create a tool that case managers and supervisors would find useful in the long-term.

At the beginning of every three months, the case manager and youth develop a goal plan. While case managers use the pre-defined list of action steps to write the goal plans, they often customize steps for specific youth. For example, an action step could be -- check in with the JPC. The case manager might add notes to this indicating the youth must meet in person every Monday and call every Thursday. At the end of the three months, the case manager scores how much progress the youth has made on each of his or her action steps using the following scale:

- 1 = No progress made on the action step
- 2 = Some progress made on the action step
- 3 = Action step completed

Evaluators then developed a custom ACCESS database to help case managers keep track of the data generated by the client goal plans. Three to five months of training time was required to assure that the database was capturing all the information needed and assure accuracy of data entry. As a result, information was not captured using this new system until March-April of 2002.

Sample Size

Case managers collected demographic information and conducted a needs assessment for every youth enrolled in the STFY/MOP program. This evaluation report includes data only for youth who filled out a permission slip allowing the researchers to use their information. As of November 1, 2002, the program database had information on 569 actively participating youth and 388 of these youth filled out a permission slip. Many of these youth are new to the program in the Summer and Fall of 2002, so only 258 youth have goal plan data that can be analyzed at this time. Youth who were enrolled in the program previous to this time, do not have pre-test (or the first 3, 6 or 9 month goal plan data) so they are not included in the study.

Statistical Analyses Conducted

There are a number of statistical analyses that will be conducted with the STFY/MOP outcome data:

1. Results/Trends Based on Frequencies and Averages
2. Statistical Significance Tests
3. Comparison Group Analysis

Results/Trends Based on Frequencies and Averages: This analysis provides information about the numbers and percentages of youth who have made particular kinds of changes during their time in the STFY/MOP program. Given that most of the youth in the program currently have only 3 month progress data available, this report describes results and trends for only a short time period. Future reports will look at the trends over a longer period of participation.

Statistical Significance Tests: Tests of statistical significance provide information about whether or not changes youth make in their lives are significant enough to reliably say they are not due to chance. To conduct tests of statistical significance, data must be available for at least two time periods (for goal plan data a comparison of 3 and 6 months, for school district and juvenile justice data a comparison of before and after

enrollment in STFY). At this time, there are 30 youth that have both 3 and 6 month goal plan results and there are 27-118 youth with school district data, and 13-25 with juvenile justice data that can be analyzed. Future reports will look at the trends for a larger group of youth and a longer time period.

Comparison Group Analysis: A comparison group analysis allows evaluators to compare youth who participate in the STFY/MOP program with youth who do not, and provides information about the extent to which changes made can be attributed to participation in the program. This is best conducted when the STFY/MOP youth have had a minimum of 12-18 months experience in the program, which will be in the Fall/Winter of 2003. The statistical approach will be a regression-based model that attempts to identify whether participation has a statistically significant effect on criminal behavior when controlling for other known risk factors.

DETERMINING IF BIAS EXISTS WITH THE STUDY GROUP

Before examining the results/trends for the first three months, it is important to identify the characteristics of the youth participating in the study and those who chose to be excluded to determine if there is any bias in the study sample. There are 388 (68.2%) youth who gave permission to be included in the study group and 181 (31.8%) youth who were excluded because they did not have a permission slip.

The STFY/MOP program serves an extremely diverse group of youth. Overall, the youth in the study group are similar demographically to the youth excluded in terms of gender, age, ethnicity, and family background. Future analyses will look at the issue of bias further once more data is collected. In the meantime, further efforts to collect more permission slips will be made to get a higher participation rate in the study.

Boys and girls were about equal in the study group, while a higher percentage of boys were among the youth not included.

	Study Group N=174	Not Included N=181
GENDER		
Male	50.0%	60.0%
Female	50.0%	40.0%

The youth served cover a wide range of ages. There was a higher percentage of youth age 16 and younger who were not included in the study, and a higher percentage of youth age 17 and older in the study group.

AGE	Study Group N=174	Not Included N=181
Less than 13	0.6%	5.5%
13	6.3%	8.8%
14	14.9%	6.6%
15	12.6%	19.9%
16	16.1%	18.2%
17	24.7%	13.3%
18+	24.7%	27.6%

The majority of STFY/MOP clients are youth of color and come from a wide range of ethnic backgrounds. There was a higher percentage of youth that were African-American that were not included in the study group.

ETHNICITY	Study Group N=174	Not Included N=181
African-American	29.6%	48.7%
Asian	17.6%	7.4%
Hispanic	10.2%	11.6%
Multiracial	6.1%	4.8%
Native American	12.8%	8.5%
Pacific Islander	5.1%	11.6%
White	7.7%	5.8%
Other	1.0%	1.6%

The majority of youth participating in the program live in a household where parents speak English as their first language. The study group and youth not included in the study are similar in this respect, although the ability to get permission slips filled out did seem to vary by cultural group. The percentages of youth with English and other languages were slightly higher for those not included in the study group, while the percentages of youth with Mien and Vietnamese speaking parents were slightly higher for the study group.

PARENTS LANGUAGE	Study Group N=174	Not Included N=181
Cambodian	8.0%	13.2%
Malay	2.3%	0.0%
Mien	10.9%	1.7%
Other	2.3%	13.2%
Samoan	2.3%	2.9%
Spanish	9.2%	7.5%
Vietnamese	8.0%	1.1%
English	56.9%	71.8%

About one half of the study group and youth not included lived in single parent homes.

LIVING SITUATION	Study Group N=388	Not Included N=181
Single Parent	53.5%	57.5%

RISK LEVEL OF YOUTH PARTICIPATING

Before examining the results, it is important to understand the risk level of youth participating. The youth were assessed on 10 risk factors. The majority (94.4%) of the youth were scored as moderate or high risk. This indicates that the youth have many complex issues they are facing and need to deal with. Additionally, 39% of the youth had involvement with the criminal justice system, 30.3% were not enrolled in school, and 40.7% of those enrolled were not attending school regularly. It is important to note that the high levels of risks in these youth's lives will impact the results that they achieve.

RESULTS/TRENDS BASED ON FREQUENCIES AND AVERAGES AT 3 AND 6 MONTHS

For all of the STFY/MOP program outcomes, there is one consistent source of data: the client goal plans. Two outcomes – Reduce Gang Involvement/Criminal Behavior and Increase Educational Involvement – have additional data from juvenile justice records and school district records, respectively.

Progress based on Juvenile Justice Records is determined by a decrease in criminal activity – i.e., criminal referrals, convictions, admissions or detention days for each youth either decline or remain at zero.

Progress based on School District Records is determined by an increase in attendance or school grades, or a decrease in discipline referrals and suspensions.

Progress based on client goal plans is determined by averaging the scores for all the action steps that each youth is taking. Case managers score progress on each action step on the client goal plan every three months using the following scale:

1. No progress made on the action step
2. Some progress made on the action step
3. Action step was completed

Since each youth is working on multiple action steps that comprise each indicator and outcome, researchers calculated averages for the action steps in three ways:

- For all outcomes combined
- For each outcome category
- For each indicator within every outcome category

Progress for each of these is based on the following ranges:

Little progress = average ranges from 1.0 to 1.67
Some progress = average ranges from 1.68 to 2.33
A lot of progress = average ranges from 2.34 to 3.0

Results for All Outcomes Combined

Results for all the outcomes combined are based on progress recorded by the client goal plans for the 161 youth who had both submitted a permission slip and had goal plan data completed. At 3 months, for all the outcome categories combined, the majority of the youth were successful in making some (28.0%) or a lot (44.7%) of progress on the action steps they were taking to achieve their outcomes.

	Level of Progress - 3 Months		
	Little	Some	A lot
ALL OUTCOMES COMBINED (N=161)	27.3%	28.0%	44.7%

There are 30 youth who had both 3 month and 6 month goal plan data available. The percentage of youth making some and a lot of progress was 70% at both 3 and 6 months. The youth with initial positive progress typically continue to make some and a lot of progress. Youth who are making a little progress typically are tackling more complex issues such as mental health, substance abuse and family issues. This typically takes 9-12 months before progress is made. Additional data will be collected to determine what the trends will be.

Level of Progress (n=30)	3 Months	6 Months
A little	30.0%	30.0%
Some	23.3%	20.0%
A lot	46.7%	50.0%

The majority of the youth are making positive progress on their goal plans. 43.3% of the youth were making improvements on their goal plans, 26.7% continued to make some or a lot of progress, while 30% are consistently not making progress.

Type of Change (N=30)	Change Between 3 and 6 Months
Not Making Progress	30.0%
Stayed Same (Some or A lot Progress)	26.7%
Making Improvement	43.3%

Results for Each Outcome Category

Results for each outcome category are based on the client goal plans. The majority of the youth were successful in making some or a lot of progress on the action steps they are working on to meet their particular outcomes. The degree of success varies by outcome category. In general, youth demonstrate greater levels of progress in outcomes such as Increase Involvement in Educational Activities, Obtain/Maintain Basic Needs, Constructive Use of Time and Seek Employment/Vocational Issues. Overall, youth demonstrated lower levels of progress with Improve Family Functioning, Increase Social Competencies, Address Mental Health Issues and Reduce Substance Use/Abuse.

Outcome Categories	Level of Progress - 3 Months		
	Little	Some	A lot
Reduce Gang Involvement/ Criminal Behavior (n=58)	20.7%	43.1%	36.2%
Increase Involvement in Educational Activities (n=117)	27.4%	27.4%	45.3%
Obtain/Maintain Basic Needs (n=12)	33.3%	0.0%	67.7%
Improve Family Functioning (n=40)	40.0%	37.5%	22.5%
Increase Social Competencies (n=34)	29.4%	52.9%	17.6%
Promote Personal Wellness/Positive Self Identity (n=9)	0.0%	77.8%	22.2%
Increase Constructive Use of Time (n=21)	23.8%	23.8%	52.4%
Seek Employment/Vocational Opportunities (n=13)	23.1%	15.4%	61.5%
Address Mental Health Issues (n=3)	67.0%	0.0%	33.3%
Reduce Substance Use/Abuse (n=13)	46.2%	15.4%	38.5%

Increase Involvement in Educational Activities is the only outcome category that has sufficient number of youth with data at both 3 and 6 months. 10% of the youth improved to a lot of progress, 40% of the youth continued to have a lot of progress, 20% continued to make some progress, and 30% remained at a little progress.

Increase Involvement in Educational Activities

Level of Progress (n=20)	3 Months	6 Months
A little	30.0%	30.0%
Some	30.0%	20.0%
A lot	40.0%	50.0%

RESULTS BY INDICATORS WITHIN EACH OUTCOME CATEGORY

OUTCOME: REDUCE GANG INVOLVEMENT/CRIMINAL BEHAVIOR

There are two sources of data for this outcome: Juvenile Justice Records and Client Goal Plans

Juvenile Justice Records

Only STFY/MOP youth that are in the Juvenile Justice database are included in this part of the analysis. A list of 222 names and birthdates was submitted to superior court. When searching the juvenile justice database, information was found for 80 (36%) STFY/MOP youth.

These 80 youth have had some criminal activity in the past. For the purposes of this analysis, a comparison is made with the 6 months prior to and after enrollment in STFY. Because of this shorter time period, the criminal activity did not show up for some of the youth in the 6 months before enrollment in STFY/MOP. These youth were excluded from this analysis since there is no pre-test data for comparison. They will be included when the analysis is extended to a longer time period. The number of youth that had information available for each type of criminal activity varies from 13-25.

For each of the youth, superior court provided anonymous information on referrals, convictions, admissions and detention days for 6 months prior to enrollment in the STFY/MOP program and 6 months afterwards.

Researchers recommend looking at results 18 months prior to and after enrollment for the greatest accuracy. Future analyses will look at results based on 18 months.

The results are presented according to the following categories:

- **Increase** -the number of referrals, convictions, admissions or detention days during the 6 months after enrollment in STFY/MOP was greater than the number during the 6 months before enrollment
- **No change** - the number of referrals, convictions, admissions or detention days during the 6 months after enrollment in STFY/MOP was the same as the number during the 6 months before enrollment
- **Decrease** - the number of referrals, convictions, admissions or detention days during the 6 months after enrollment in STFY/MOP was less than the number during the 6 months before enrollment

Since 6 months is such a short period of time and there are delays in the legal system, the youth are considered successful in achieving progress toward this outcome if there is no change or a decrease in criminal activity. No change in criminal activity is commonly considered successful over a short period of time when youth first enroll in a program. Previous criminal activity may be catching up with the youth shortly after they enroll in the STFY/MOP program and may be continuing during the first few months of enrollment while a relationship is being built with the case manager. It is not realistic to expect criminal activity to drop immediately.

The criteria for success will be more stringent at 18 months, when a decrease in criminal activity will be required for STFY/MOP youth to be considered successful.

A comparison of the 6 months before STFY/MOP enrollment with the 6 months after shows that the 84.6% of the youth were successful by decreasing felony referrals. The change in felony referrals is significant which indicates the improvement is due to more than chance alone. These results should be examined over 18 months for a more accurate picture of progress.

FELONY REFERRALS N = 13	6 months before STFY enrollment	6 months after STFY enrollment
0 Felony Referrals	0.0%	84.6%
1-3 Felony Referrals	100.0%	15.4%

CHANGE IN FELONY REFERRALS* N=13	6 Months Before and After
Increase	0.0%
No Change	15.4%
Decreased	84.6%

* Change is significant, $p < .001$

A comparison of the 6 months before STFY/MOP enrollment with the 6 months after shows that the 64% of the youth were successful in decreasing total referrals (misdemeanor and felony). Before enrollment in STFY, all of the youth had 1-3 referrals, while 56% of the youth had no referrals after enrollment in STFY. The change in total referrals is significant which indicates the improvement is due to more than chance alone. These results should be examined over 18 months for a more accurate picture of progress.

TOTAL REFERRALS N = 25	6 months before STFY enrollment	6 months after STFY enrollment
0 Referrals	0.0%	56.0%
1-3 Referrals	100.0%	40.0%
4-6 Referrals	0.0%	4.0%

TOTAL REFERRALS* N=25	6 Months Before and After
Increase	8.0%
No Change	28.0%
Decrease	64.0%

*Change is significant, $p < .05$

A comparison of the 6 months before STFY/MOP enrollment with the 6 months after shows that the 68% of the youth were successful by decreasing the severity of their referrals. Before enrollment in STFY, 92% of the youth had severity scores 4+, while decreased to 40% after enrollment. The change in the severity of referrals is significant which indicates the improvement is due to more than chance alone. These results should be examined over 18 months for a more accurate picture of progress.

SEVERITY OF REFERRALS N = 25	6 months before STFY enrollment	6 months after STFY enrollment
0 Severity Score (due to 0 referrals)	0.0%	56.0%
1-3 Severity Score	8.0%	6.0%
4-6 Severity Score	72.0%	32.0%
7+ Severity Score	20.0%	8.0%

SEVERITY OF REFERRALS* N=25	6 Months Before and After
Increase	24.0%
No Change	8.0%
Decrease	68.0%

* Change is significant, $p < .001$

A comparison of the 6 months before STFY/MOP enrollment with the 6 months after shows that the 87.5% of the youth were successful by decreasing the number of convictions. Before enrollment in STFY, 0% of the youth had no convictions, while only 87.5% had no convictions after enrollment. The change in the convictions is significant which indicates the improvement is due to more than chance alone. These results should be examined over 18 months for a more accurate picture of progress.

CONVICTIONS N = 8	6 months before STFY enrollment	6 months after STFY enrollment
0 Convictions	0.0%	87.5%
1 Conviction	87.5%	12.5%
2 Convictions	12.5%	0.0%

CONVICTIONS* N=8	6 Months Before and After
Increase	0.0%
No Change	12.5%
Decrease	87.5%

* Change is significant, $p < .001$

A comparison of the 6 months before STFY/MOP enrollment with the 6 months after shows that the 70.6 % of the youth were successful in decreasing admissions to detention. Before enrollment in STFY, 0% of the youth had no admissions to detention, while 64.7% had no admissions after enrollment. The change in the admissions to detention is significant which indicates the improvement is due to more than chance alone. These results should be examined over 18 months for a more accurate picture of progress.

ADMISSIONS TO DETENTION N = 17	6 months before STFY enrollment	6 months after STFY enrollment
0 Admissions	0.0%	64.7%
1-3 Admissions	88.2%	35.3%
4-6 Admissions	11.8%	0.0%

ADMISSIONS TO DETENTION* N = 17	6 Months Before and After
Increase	17.6%
No Change	11.8%
Decrease	70.6%

* Change is significant, $p < .05$

A comparison of the 6 months before STFY/MOP enrollment with the 6 months after shows that the 88.2% of the youth were successful in decreasing days in detention. Before enrollment in STFY, 0% of the youth had no detention days, while 58.8% had no detention days after enrollment. These results should be examined over 18 months for a more accurate picture of progress.

DETENTION DAYS N = 17	6 months before STFY enrollment	6 months after STFY enrollment
0 Detention Days	0.0%	58.8%
1-5 Detention Days	52.9%	23.5%
6-10 Detention Days	29.4%	0.0%
11+ Detention Days	17.6%	17.6%

CHANGE IN DETENTION DAYS (N=17)	6 Months Before and After
Increase	11.8%
No Change	0.0%
Decrease	88.2%

Client Goal Plans

Note: Data is only available for 3 months. The sample size of 30 at 6 months is not enough to break into indicator categories. Even at 3 months, the sample sizes are small for many of the indicators in this outcome, so trends should be considered preliminary until further data is collected. Though the sample size is small for many of the indicators, the majority of the youth were successful making some or a lot of progress on indicators for this outcome. A higher percentage of youth made a lot of progress for two indicators: comply with diversion requirements, and comply with probation requirements. A higher percentage of youth made some progress for two indicators: comply with truancy court order and fulfill community service requirements. A higher percentage of youth made a little progress for the indicators: comply with drug court orders and reduce illegal aggressive behaviors.

Indicators	Level of Progress - 3 Months		
	Little	Some	A lot
Comply with diversion requirements (n=4)	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%
Comply with drug court orders (n=2)	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Comply with probation requirements (n=2)	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%
Comply with truancy court orders (n=4)	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
Fulfill community service requirements (n=2)	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
Reduce criminal activity (n=13)	30.8%	38.5%	30.8%
Reduce gang activity (n=14)	35.7%	35.7%	28.6%
Reduce illegal aggressive behaviors (n=4)	50.0%	25.0%	25.0%

OUTCOME: INCREASE INVOLVEMENT IN EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

There are two sources of data for this outcome: School District Records and Client Goal Plans.

School District Records

From the list of names provided, the Seattle School District was able to find school district records for 168 STFY/MOP youth. Of these youth, 118 youth had matching data available for both school years.

Before they enrolled in the STFY/MOP program, 30% of the youth were not enrolled in school. Within the first few months of enrolling in STFY, the number not enrolled dropped to 24.4%. It is reasonable to assume this trend will continue and more youth will enroll in school. Additional data will be collected to determine what future trends will be.

School Enrollment N = 118	Before STFY enrollment 2001-02 school year	After STFY enrollment Fall 2002
Enrolled in School	69.7%	75.6%
Not Enrolled in School	30.3%	24.4%

This analysis is based on 48 youth that were attending school less than 80% of the time. There was an increase in the percent of days school was attended. The youth attended 49.6% of the school days in 2001-02 and 64% of the school days in the Fall of 2002. There was an increase in the percent of youth that were attending 80% of the time or more. There were no youth in 2001-02 who were while 37.5% were afterwards. Given the many unmet basic needs, family issues, mental health, and substance abuse issues these youth face, it is not surprising that some youth are not making progress attending school within the first few months. It is reasonable to assume this positive trend will continue and youth's attendance will improve further once they are enrolled in the program longer. Additional data will be collected to determine what future trends will be.

School Attendance N = 48	Before STFY enrollment 2001-02 school year	After STFY enrollment Fall 2002
Percent days attended school	49.6%	64.0%

School Attendance N = 48	Before STFY enrollment 2001-02 school year	After STFY enrollment Fall 2002
Attending less than 50% of the time	60.4%	35.4%
Attending less than 50-79% of time	39.6%	27.1%
Attending 80% or more of the time	0.0%	37.5%

Change in School Attendance* N = 48	Change between 2001-02 school year and Fall 2002
Increasing	70.8%
Stayed the Same	0.0%
Decreasing	29.2%

*Change is Significant, $p < .005$

There were 42 youth who were old enough to have High School GPA information available. Before they were enrolled in the STFY/MOP program, 40.5% of the youth did not have passing grades. There was a big improvement by Fall of 2002 with 83.3% of the youth having passing grades. 54.8% of the youth improved their grades after enrolling in STFY and another 28.6% maintained passing grades. Half of the youth that improved their grades were not passing the year before. This change in GPA is significant at the .005 level which demonstrates that the change in GPA is not due to chance alone. The long-term impact on grades will be determined when additional school year data is collected.

High School GPA N = 42	Before STFY enrollment 2001-02 school year	After STFY enrollment Fall 2002
Passing grades	57.5%	83.3%
Not passing grades	40.5%	16.7%

Change in GPA* N = 42	Change between 2001-02 school year and Fall 2002
Not passing both times	16.7%
Passing both times	28.6%
Improved, passing	54.8%

*Change is Significant, $p < .005$

There were 27 youth that were enrolled and had discipline referral data available. Before they enrolled in the STFY/MOP program, 0% of the youth had no discipline referrals, while after they enrolled 70.4% of the youth had none. 96.3% of the youth had a decrease in discipline referrals after they enrolled in STFY. This change in discipline referrals is significant at the .005 level which demonstrates that the change in discipline referrals is not due to chance alone. The long-term impact on discipline referrals will be determined when additional school year data is collected.

Discipline Referrals N = 27	Before STFY enrollment 2001-02 school year	After STFY enrollment Fall 2002
No Discipline Referrals	0.0%	70.4%
Discipline Referrals 1-3 per year	74.1%	22.2
Discipline Referrals 4-6 per year	22.2%	7.4%
Discipline Referrals 7+ per year	3.7%	0.0%

Change in Discipline Referrals* N = 27	Change between 2001-02 school year and Fall 2002
Decreasing Referrals	96.3%
Referrals Stayed Same	3.7%
Increasing Referrals	0.0%

*Change is Significant, $p < .005$

There were 27 youth that were enrolled and had suspension data available. Before they enrolled in the STFY/MOP program, 3.7% of the youth had no suspensions, while after they enrolled 70.4% of the youth had none. 96.3% of the youth had a decrease in suspensions after they enrolled in STFY. This change in suspensions is significant at the .005 level which demonstrates that the change in suspensions is not due to chance alone. The long-term impact on suspensions will be determined when additional school year data is collected.

School Suspensions N = 27	Before STFY enrollment 2001-02 school year	After STFY enrollment Fall 2002
No Suspensions	3.7%	70.4%
Suspensions 1-3 per year	74.1%	22.2%
Suspensions 4-6 per year	8.5%	7.4%
Suspensions 7+ per year	3.7%	0.0%

Change in Suspensions* N = 27	Change between 2001-02 school year and Fall 2002
Decreasing Suspensions	96.3%
Suspensions Stayed Same	3.7%
Increasing Suspensions	0.0%

*Change is Significant, $p < .005$

Client Goal Plans

The majority of the youth were successful making some or a lot of progress on indicators for this outcome. A higher percentage of youth made a lot of progress for the indicators: enroll in school, improve school behavior, improve school performance and complete high school or equivalency. These results are consistent with the school district records. A higher percentage of youth made a little progress for the indicators: attend school regularly and improve school attendance. This is also consistent with school district records.

Indicators	Level of Progress - 3 Months		
	Little	Some	A lot
Enroll in middle school or high school (n=27)	33.3%	22.2%	44.4%
Attend school regularly (n=33)	39.4%	30.3%	30.3%
Improve school behavior (n=9)	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%
Improve school performance (n=16)	18.8%	37.5%	43.8%
Improve school attendance (n=18)	33.3%	38.9%	27.8%
Complete high school or equivalency (n=6)	16.7%	0.0%	83.3%

FACTORS INFLUENCING RESULTS

IMPACT OF DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS ON OUTCOMES

Evaluators examined three demographic factors to determine their impact on outcomes: gender, age and ethnicity. Based on the trends at three months, demographic factors appear to be impacting outcomes slightly. Data from a longer time period will be used to confirm these trends.

Gender

Overall, there were more males with criminal activity. Of the youth with criminal activity, there were more females with increases in total referrals, while males had more decreases in total referrals. Both had decreases in felony referrals. Males had a slightly higher percentage with an increase in severity of referrals, and females had a slightly higher percentage of admissions to detention. Future analyses need to determine if these trends continue over time and with a larger sample size.

Level of progress measured by juvenile justice criminal activity records showed some variation by gender, as illustrated by the following five tables. All of these five tables refer to the 6 month time period after enrollment in the STFY/MOP program.

Males had a higher percentage of decrease in total referrals, while females had increases, no change and decreases in total referrals. Future analyses should determine if these trends continue over a longer period of time and with a larger sample size.

Gender (n=25)	Total Referrals -- 6 Months Before and After		
	Increase	No Change	Decrease
Female (N=6)	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%
Male (N=19)	0.0%	26.3%	73.7%

The majority of both females and males had a decrease in felony referrals. Males had a slightly higher percentage of decreases in felony referrals. Females have a higher percentage of no change in felony referrals. Future analyses should determine if these trends continue over a longer period of time and with a larger sample size.

	Felony Referrals - Change 6 Months Before and After		
Gender (n=13)	Increase	No Change	Decrease
Female (N=4)	0.0%	25.0%	75.0%
Male (N=9)	0.0%	11.1%	88.9%

Females and males were similar in the percentage that decreased the severity of referrals. Males had a higher percentage of increase in the severity of referrals. Future analyses should determine if these trends continue over a longer period of time and with a larger sample size.

	Severity of Referrals - Change 6 Months Before and After		
Gender (n=25)	Increase	No Change	Decrease
Female (N=6)	16.7%	16.7%	66.7%
Male (N=19)	26.3%	5.3%	68.4%

Females had a higher percentage of increases in admissions. Males had a higher percentage of decreases in admissions to detention. Future analyses should determine if these trends continue over a longer period of time and with a larger sample size.

	Detention Admissions- Change 6 Months Before and After		
Gender (n=17)	Increase	No Change	Decrease
Female (N=7)	28.6%	14.3%	57.1%
Male (N=10)	10.0%	10.0%	80.0%

Females and males were similar in the percentage of a lot of progress made on their action steps. There were more females making a little progress on their action steps, while there were more males making some progress.

Gender (N=122)	Level of Progress - 3 Months		
	Little	Some	A lot
Female (N=59)	37.3%	23.7%	39.0%
Male (N=63)	25.4%	33.3%	41.3%

Age

Age also impacts outcomes in the area of criminal activity. A larger proportion of the youth involved with criminal activity were age 15 and 16. Youth age 14 and 15 had the largest decreases in criminal activity. This is consistent with progress that youth make on the action steps on their goal plans. Youth ages 11-12 had the higher percentage of a little progress, and youth older than age 14 made more progress. Future analyses need to determine if these trends continue over time and with a larger sample size.

(Note: criminal activity data are available only through age 17. Once youth turn 18, they become part of the adult legal system.)

Overall, there were more youth age 15 and 16 with referrals. The highest increases in referrals were with youth younger than age 13. The highest percentage of no change in referrals were with youth age 13 and 16 year olds. The highest decreases in referrals were for youth age 14, 15 and 17. Future analyses should determine if these trends continue over a longer period of time and with a larger sample size.

Age (n=25)	Total Referrals - Change 6 Months Before and After		
	Increase	No Change	Decrease
< 13 (N=4)	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%
13 (N=2)	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%
14 (N=4)	0.0%	25.0%	75.0%
15 (N=7)	0.0%	14.3%	85.7%
16 (N=7)	0.0%	57.1%	12.5%
17 (N=1)	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%

Overall, there were more youth with felony referrals that were age 15 and 16. All of the youth had decreases in felony referrals. The highest decreases in felony referrals were youth age 15 and younger. Youth age 16 had a higher percentage with no change in felony referrals. Future analyses should determine if these trends continue over a longer period of time and with a larger sample size.

Age (n=13)	Felony Referrals - Change 6 Months Before and After		
	Increase	No Change	Decrease
< 13 (N=1)	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
13 (N=1)	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
14 (N=2)	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
15 (N=4)	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
16 (N=5)	0.0%	40.0%	60.0%

Overall, there were more youth age 15 and 16 that had severity of referrals. Most youth had a decrease in the severity of referrals. The highest decreases in the severity of referrals were with youth less than age 13, 14 and 15. There was one youth ages less than 13, 14, 15, 16 and 2 youth age 16 that had an increase in severity of referrals. Future analyses should determine if these trends continue over a longer period of time and with a larger sample size.

Age (n=25)	Severity of Referrals - Change 6 Months Before and After		
	Increase	No Change	Decrease
< 13 (N=4)	25.0%	0.0%	75.0%
13 (N=2)	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%
14 (N=4)	25.0%	0.0%	75.0%
15 (N=7)	14.3%	0.0%	85.7%
16 (N=7)	28.6%	14.3%	57.1%
17 (N=1)	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Overall, there were more youth age 16 that had admissions to detention. The highest increases in admissions to detention were with youth age 13. The highest decreases in admissions to detention were for youth age 16. The highest percentage of none was for youth less than 13, 14, 15, and 17.

Age (n=17)	Detention Admissions - Change 6 Months Before and After		
	Increase	No Change	Decrease
< 13 (N=1)	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
13 (N=1)	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
14 (N=2)	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%
15 (N=2)	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
16 (N=9)	11.1%	11.1%	77.8%
17 (N=2)	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%

Level of progress on client goal plans varies by age group. Youth age 13, 14, 15 and 16 had the lowest levels of progress while 17 and 18 year olds had the highest levels of progress.

Age (N=122)	Level of Progress - 3 Months		
	Little	Some	A lot
< 13 (N=1)	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
13 (N=5)	60.0%	20.0%	20.0%
14 (N=16)	31.3%	31.3%	37.5%
15 (N=14)	42.9%	35.7%	21.4%
16 (N=22)	36.4%	36.4%	27.3%
17 (N=29)	24.1%	27.6%	48.3%
18+ (N=35)	25.7%	20.0%	54.3%

Ethnicity

There were differences in criminal activity by ethnicity. Asians had a higher percentage of decrease in criminal activity, while whites had a higher percentage of increase in criminal activity, and African-Americans had a higher percentage of no change. Whites and African-Americans had a higher percentage of increase in severity of referrals while Asians had a higher percentage of decrease in severity of referrals. Future analyses should determine if these trends continue over a longer time period and with a larger sample size.

Asians had a higher percentage of decreases in total referrals, while whites had a higher percentage of increases in total referrals, and African-Americans had a higher percentage of no change. Future analyses should determine if these trends continue over a longer time period and with a larger sample size.

Ethnicity (N=25)	Total Referrals -- 6 Months Before and After		
	Increase	No Change	Decrease
Asian (N=6)	0.0%	16.7%	83.3%
African-American (10)	0.0%	40.0%	60.0%
White (N=7)	28.6%	14.3%	57.1%
Other (N=2)	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%

Asians and whites had a higher percentage of decreases in severity of referrals, while whites and African-Americans had a higher percentage of increase in severity of referrals. Future analyses should determine if these trends continue over a longer time period and with a larger sample size.

Ethnicity (N=25)	Severity of Referrals -- 6 Months Before and After		
	Increase	No Change	Decrease
Asian (N=6)	16.7%	0.0%	83.3%
African-American (10)	30.0%	10.0%	60.0%
White (N=7)	28.6%	0.0%	71.4%
Other (N=2)	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%

After three months of participation, progress toward outcomes varies among the different ethnic groups. Pacific Islander youth had the highest percentages of a lot of progress, followed by White, African-American, Multiracial, Hispanic and Native American youth. Asian youth had lower percentages of a lot of progress.

ETHNICITY (N=121)	Level of Progress - 3 Months		
	Little	Some	A lot
African-American (N=29)	10.3%	37.9%	51.7%
Asian (N=43)	37.2%	41.9%	20.9%
Hispanic (N=9)	31.6%	21.1%	47.4%
Multiracial (n=6)	33.3%	16.7%	50.0%
Native American (n=17)	58.8%	0.0%	41.2%
Pacific Islander (N=5)	20.0%	0.0%	80.0%
White (N=11)	36.4%	9.1%	54.5%
Other (N=1)	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%

IMPACT OF INTAKE ASSESSMENT SCORES ON OUTCOMES

Upon intake, case managers assess youth on the same 10 outcome categories that their goal plans are intended to measure. For this analysis, the youth receive a score of 1 on an outcome if the case manager and youth agree it is not an issue, a 2 if the youth and case manager agree it is an issue and a 3 if the case manager believes it is an issue (based on feedback from parents, school and police) but the client is not willing to acknowledge that the issue exists.

When the scores for each of the 10 outcome categories are added up, the total overall score can range from 0-30 points. The higher the score, the greater the needs and risks the youth faces. The table below indicates the percentages of study group youth in the low, moderate, and high risk categories according to their total intake assessment score.

Note: not all of the youth had intake assessments completed. The total number of youth that had complete intake assessments, progress scores, and permission slips was 107. The following analyses are based on these 107 youth.

The majority of the STFY/MOP youth are moderate to high risk. This indicates that the youth are dealing with multiple, complex issues in their lives. Most of the youth (73.8%) were willing to acknowledge these issues exist (moderate scores). However, 20.6% of the youth had these issues in their lives but were not willing to acknowledge and address them (high scores) which makes it more challenging to make progress on goal plans.

TOTAL INTAKE RISK SCORE	RISK	Study Group N=107
0-10 points	Low	5.6%
11-20 points	Moderate	73.8%
21-30 points	High	20.6%

Intake risk scores influence progress on outcomes. For all outcomes combined, youth with high risk scores had a higher percentage of some progress, while youth with moderate scores had a higher percentage of a lot of progress. For specific outcomes such as increase involvement with educational activities and reduce gang activity/criminal behavior, youth with low and moderate risk score were more likely to make a lot of progress on their action steps on their goal plans, while youth with high risk scores were more likely to make some progress.

Youth with moderate and high total intake scores both had 27.3%-30.4% of the youth that made a little progress on their action steps on their goal plans. Youth with moderate risk scores had a higher percentage of a lot of progress while youth with high risk scores had a higher percentage of some progress. There are too few youth with low risk scores to make a comparison.

All Outcomes Combined (n=107) 3 Months	TOTAL INTAKE RISK SCORE		
	Low (N=6)	Moderate (N=79)	High (N=22)
Average Progress = A little	50.0%	30.4%	27.3%
Average Progress = Some	16.7%	38.0%	50.0%
Average Progress = A lot	33.3%	31.6%	22.7%

Because only three months worth of data is available at this time, the impact assessment scores had on outcomes were analyzed for only two outcomes: Reduce gang involvement/criminal behavior and increase involvement in educational activities.

Each outcome will be examined two ways:

1. How progress on that outcome relates to the youth's intake risk score for just that outcome (i.e., criminal intake risk score)
2. How progress on that outcome relates to the youth's total intake risk score

Impact of Intake Assessment Scores on the Outcome: Reduced Gang Involvement/Criminal Behavior

12 of the STFY/MOP youth who had action steps for this outcome also had complete intakes. Youth with moderate criminal risk scores were the only ones that made a lot of progress on their action steps. Future analyses need to determine if these trends continue over a longer period of time and with a larger sample size.

Reduced Gang Involvement/ Criminal Behavior (N=12) - 3 Months	CRIMINAL INTAKE RISK SCORE		
	Low (N=4)	Moderate (N=11)	High (N=2)
Average Progress = A little	50.0%	54.5%	100.0%
Average Progress = Some	50.0%	18.2%	0.0%
Average Progress = A lot	0.0%	27.3%	0.0%

There were no youth with low risk scores that were working on this outcome. All the youth had moderate or high risk scores. The progress is similar for both moderate and high risk scores. Half of the youth made a little progress while the other half made some or a lot of progress.

Reduced Gang Involvement/ Criminal Behavior (N=12) - 3 Months	TOTAL INTAKE RISK SCORE		
	Low (N=0)	Moderate (N=11)	High (N=2)
Average Progress = A little	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%
Average Progress = Some	0.0%	40.0%	50.0%
Average Progress = A lot	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%

Impact of Intake Assessment Scores on the Outcome: Increased Involvement in Educational Activities

87-88 STFY/MOP youth who had action steps for this outcome also had complete intakes. Youth with high education intake risk scores had the largest percentage of some and a lot of progress. Youth with moderate scores has the largest percentage of a little progress.

Increased Involvement in Educational Activities (N=88) - 3 Months	EDUCATION INTAKE RISK SCORE		
	Low (N=7)	Moderate (N=67)	High (N=14)
Average Progress = A little	0.0%	37.3%	7.1%
Average Progress = Some	100.0%	32.8%	42.9%
Average Progress = A lot	0.0%	29.9%	50.0%

All the youth (low, moderate and high) had a similar percentage of a lot of progress. Youth with moderate and high total intake risk scores had the largest percentage of some progress. Youth with low total intake risk scores had the largest percentage of a little progress.

Increased Involvement in Educational Activities (N=87) -- 3 Months	TOTAL INTAKE RISK SCORE		
	Low (N=6)	Moderate (N=67)	High (N=14)
Average Progress = A little	50.0%	29.9%	21.4%
Average Progress = Some	16.7%	38.8%	50.0%
Average Progress = A lot	33.3%	31.3%	28.6%

YOUTH NOT MAKING PROGRESS

It is often helpful to look closely at the youth who are not making progress toward their outcomes, to try to determine why and then use that information to improve the program.

It is important to determine if the youth are making little progress on all their outcomes or just one outcome. The majority of the youth were working on 3 or more outcomes. The youth making a little progress had a higher percentage of youth working on only 1 or 2 outcomes, while youth making some and a lot of progress had a higher percentage working on 3 or more outcomes.

Number of Outcomes	A Little Progress (N= 55)	Some and A lot of Progress (N=107)
1	30.9%	21.5%
2	25.5%	21.5%
3 or more	43.6%	57.0%

Next, it is helpful to look at which outcome categories the youth were working on. The youth making some or a lot of progress had a slightly higher percentage that were working on family functioning and reduce gang involvement/criminal behavior. The youth making a little progress had a slightly higher percentage that were working on increase constructive use of time, seek employment/vocational opportunities, obtain/maintain basic needs and mental health issues. Both had similar percentages working on increase involvement in educational activities, increase social competencies and reduce substance use/abuse.

Outcome Category	A Little Progress (N=55)	Some or A lot of Progress (N=107)
Increase Constructive Use of Time	11.1%	5.1%
Seek Employment/Vocational Opportunities	7.3%	4.7%
Improve Family Functioning	12.0%	15.4%
Increase Involvement in Educational Activities	35.1%	36.6%
Address Mental Health Issues	1.6%	0.6%
Obtain/Maintain Basic Needs	4.7%	1.8%
Promote Personal Wellness/Positive Self Identity	0.0%	1.9%
Reduce Gang Involvement/Criminal Behavior	12.6%	18.7%
Increase Social Competencies	12.6%	11.9%
Reduce Substance Use/Abuse	3.1%	3.3%

IMPLICATIONS OF THE RESULTS

Before looking at the implications of the results, it is important to look at the youth participating and accuracy of data sources.

- The youth who chose to participate in the study were similar demographically to those who declined participation.
- The majority (94.4%) of the youth in the program were assessed at moderate to high risk for 10 risk factors. 39.6% had known criminal activity, 30.3% were not enrolled in school and 40.7% of those enrolled were not attending regularly.
- The results were consistent among the 3 types of measurement tools: juvenile justice records, school district records and client goal plans.

The results indicate the following:

- The majority of the youth were making positive progress towards the program's intended outcomes.
- There is significant positive change for attendance, GPA, school discipline referrals, school suspensions, felony referrals, total referrals, severity of referrals, convictions, and admissions to detention.
- The majority of the youth were making a lot or some progress on action steps on their client goals plans with particular success with the outcomes: increase involvement with educational activities, obtain/maintain basic needs, increase constructive use of time, and seek employment/vocational opportunities.
- The majority of the youth had reductions in criminal activity and severity of criminal activity during the first 6 months of enrollment in STFY. A longer time period is needed to confirm these trends and see if further improvement occurs.
- The majority of the youth improved their attendance and GPA and reduced school discipline referrals and suspensions during the first 6 months in STFY. A longer time period is needed to confirm these trends and see if further improvement occurs.
- Demographic factors such as gender, age and ethnicity influenced the youth outcomes.
 - There was some variation by gender. Overall, the majority of both genders had a decrease in criminal activity. There were fewer females with criminal activity. Of the youth with criminal activity, there were more females with increases in total referrals, while there were more males with decreases in

total referrals. Both had high percentages with decreases in felony referrals. Males had a higher percentage of increases in severity in referrals, while females had a higher percentage with an increase in admissions to detention. While there were fewer females with criminal activity, they were making slightly less progress on their action steps on goal plans.

- There was some variation by age. Overall, there was more criminal activity with 15 and 16 year olds. Youth age 14 and 15 had the largest decreases in criminal activity. Older youth made more progress on the action steps on goal plans.
- There was some variation by different ethnic groups. Asians had a higher percentage of youth with an increase in total referrals, yet the severity of referrals had the largest decrease. African-Americans and whites had a larger decrease in total referrals, but the severity of referrals had a bigger increase.
- Intake risk factors also influence outcomes. For all outcomes combined, youth with moderate and high total intake risk scores both had high levels of progress on the action steps on their client goal plans. Youth with moderate risk scores (indicating a willingness to address the issues) had a higher percentage of a lot of progress.
- There is a small group of youth that are not making progress on: action steps on their client goal plans to reduce criminal activity and improve school performance. These youth shared some common characteristics: high total risk factor scores, unwillingness to acknowledge risk factors in their lives, males with previous felony referrals and detentions, and younger youth.
- There is a small group of youth not making progress on client goal plans. They were more likely to be working on action steps related to mental health issues and basic needs.
- Outcomes that have lower levels of progress overall were: improve family functioning, address mental health issues, and reduce substance use/abuse. These are typically harder to address and take longer than 3-6 months to make progress on.

Data collection efforts need to be improved in the following ways:

- Intake assessments need to be reviewed at the time goal plans are written to make changes as needed. It is suspected that more information is gained on client needs as goal plans are written which is not reflected or changed in the intake assessment.
- Some data elements such as language spoken by parents and youth ethnicity need to be checked to verify the proper use of these fields.
- Future efforts should look to see if anything can be done to achieve a higher match rate with names and birthdates for school district records and juvenile justice records.
- More permission slips need to be collected in order to increase the validity of the evaluation data.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Celebrate the positive successes the youth and families are making in the STFY/MOP program. Best practices include celebrations to provide motivation for further progress.
2. Continue using the goal plan tool and gathering school district records and juvenile justice records. Consistent tools and information must be gathered to determine whether youth are meeting the program's intended outcomes.
3. Repeat this analysis with data over a longer time period. This is necessary to determine if these initial positive results continue over time. It will also help identify patterns that lead to success for youth facing different issues, and how much time it takes for them to be successful.
4. Determine if changes over a longer period of time are statistically significant also. The STFY/MOP program can then demonstrate that the changes are not due just to chance alone.
5. Identify factors that influence success over time. This is important information for best practices so case managers learn what types of action plans work best with different youth characteristics.
6. Identify factors that are barriers to success over time. This is important information for best practices so case managers learn how to help youth overcome these barriers and hopefully, avoid them before they occur.
7. Discuss how case managers can address these factors in their day-to-day work and what types of training would be useful. This discussion is critical to continue the successes of some youth and increase the successes of youth who are struggling still.

CONCLUSIONS

Even after three to six months of participation, the majority of the STFY/MOP youth are making positive progress toward the program's intended outcomes. Criminal activity and school performance have had some significant change. This is a positive trend given such a short period of time.

Further analysis is needed to determine if this trend continues and what patterns of change occur over a longer period of time so that the program can learn what type of intensity and duration is necessary for different youth participating in the program.