

Shasta County Probation Department Juvenile Prevention and Education Program Local Evaluation Plan

Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA)
Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program

Prepared for

Shasta County Probation Department
2684 Radio Lane
Redding, CA 96001

Prepared by

EMT Associates, Inc.
1631 Creekside Drive, Suite 100
Folsom, CA 95630

December 2019

Project Background

In 2018 the California Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) was awarded \$18 million in funding under the U.S. Department of Justice's Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) program to support state and local justice programs and initiatives. As the largest source of federal justice system funding, the JAG program supports eight Program Purpose Areas (PPAs), including:

- Law enforcement programs;
- Prosecution and court programs, including indigent defense;
- Prevention and education programs;
- Corrections and community corrections programs;
- Drug treatment and enforcement programs;
- Planning, evaluation and technology improvement programs;
- Crime victim and witness programs (other than compensation), and;
- Mental health programs and related law enforcement and corrections programs, including behavioral programs and crisis intervention team.

The state of California prioritizes three of the eight federal PPAs, including prevention and education programs, law enforcement, and prosecution and court programs. BSCC directs federal funds to local jurisdictions through a competitive grant process. The Shasta County Probation Department was one of several county agencies across the state to be awarded a three-year grant under the 2018 JAG grant cohort. The Probation Department is using grant funds to establish the Shasta County JAG Juvenile Prevention and Education program, which supports an array of evidence-based prevention and education programming and youth development opportunities serving disadvantaged youth in school, community, and juvenile detention settings.

As a requirement of funding, each JAG sub-grant recipient must plan and implement a comprehensive evaluation of their funded grant program. The purpose of the evaluation is to monitor fidelity of implementation and to test the effectiveness of proposed strategies in achieving youth outcomes related to delinquency prevention and reduced risk for justice system involvement. The present document details local plans for evaluating the Shasta County Probation Department's Prevention and Education grant program over the three-year project period. The plan is designed as a working document that can be expanded and refined as the project evolves in response to changing needs and circumstances. The evaluation plan was designed to support measurement of proposed goals and objectives and ensure compliance with state and federal reporting requirements.

Shasta County Juvenile Prevention and Education Goals and Objectives

The Shasta County JAG Prevention and Education grant has two overarching goals that align with the grant's two proposed strategy areas. The first goal is to expand prevention and education programs available to disadvantaged youth in the community to increase school and community

engagement, reduce risks for juvenile delinquency, and prevent juvenile justice system involvement. The second goal is to expand rehabilitative services for youth in juvenile detention settings to improve behavioral functioning and prevent future reentry into the juvenile justice system.

Specific program objectives include the following:

- By the end of each contract year, provider agencies will reach the targeted number of youth through school- and community-based settings and will offer an array of prevention and education programs and services addressing substance abuse and violence prevention, academic enrichment, job skills training and workforce development, and pro-social engagement.
- By the end of each contract year, provider agencies will implement planned evidence-based program components with fidelity and youth will complete evidence-based program models.
- By the end of each contract year, youth participants in community-based programs and activities will report high levels of satisfaction on measures of staffing and program quality and will perceive positive impacts from their participation.
- By the end of each contract year, youth who actively participated in evidence-based program components will demonstrate reductions in risk behaviors and increases in social competence as measured on pre-post surveys.
- By the end of the grant funded period, youth in detention settings who participated in rehabilitative intervention services (i.e., fine arts therapy, multi-sensory de-escalation, and in-custody sports programs) will perceive positive impacts on pro-social attitudes and behavioral functioning that they attribute to program participation.

JAG Prevention and Education Program Model

The Shasta County Probation Department JAG Prevention and Education program is being implemented through a community collaboration involving the City of Redding, Youth Options Shasta (formerly the Youth Violence Prevention Council of Shasta County) and the Shasta County Child Abuse Prevention Coordinating Council. The Shasta County JAG Prevention and Education program funds an array of supplemental youth development programs for disadvantaged youth that are delivered in community-based settings, including teen centers and non-profit organizations. These programs address youth needs for educational support, workforce readiness and job skills training, and pro-social recreational opportunities. The program also funds implementation of five more intensive, evidence-based program models, including the following.

Project Towards No Drug Abuse (TND) is a drug abuse prevention program that serves high school-age youth 14-19 years of age. The program is listed as an effective delinquency program on the National Gang Center's Strategic Planning Tool (SPT) Program Matrix. Project TND can be implemented in classroom or community-based settings by a trained facilitator. The program involves 12 sessions, 40 to 50 minutes in length. The program can be implemented three-times per week over a four-week period, or twice a week over a six-week period. The program objectives are to prevent or reduce the use of cigarettes, alcohol, marijuana, and other drugs (i.e., cocaine, hallucinogens, depressants, amphetamines, etc.). Project TND will be implemented through the Anderson Teen Center and Youth Options.

Girls Circle is a structured support group for girls from 9-18 years that integrates relational theory, resiliency practices, and skills training in a specific format designed to increase positive connection, personal and collective strengths, and competence in girls. Originally developed in 1995, Girls Circle aims to counteract social and interpersonal forces that impede girls' growth and development by promoting an emotionally safe setting and structure within which girls can develop caring relationships and use authentic voices.¹ Girls Circle was listed on the Office of Justice Programs National Criminal Justice Reference Service and on SAMHSA's National Registry of Evidence-based Programs. Girls Circle groups will be implemented through the Anderson Teen Center and the MLK Center. The program targets increases in school attachment, educational expectation, educational aspiration, social support, positive body image, self-efficacy, and communication with adults and decreases in unsafe sexual behaviors, alcohol and drug use, and self-harm.

The **Council for Boys and Young Men** is a strengths-based group approach to promote boys' and young men's safe and healthy passage through pre-teen and adolescent years. Boys Council meets a core developmental need for positive relationships, the opportunity to address masculinity definitions and behaviors and to build leadership capacities individually and collectively.² Boys Council groups will be implemented through the Anderson Teen Center and the MLK Center. Boys Council targets increases in school engagement, confidence in avoiding fighting, ethnic pride and tolerance for diversity, and conflict skills and reduces aggression.

Aggression Replacement Training (ART). Aggression Replacement Training® is a cognitive behavioral intervention program to help children and adolescents improve social skill competence and moral reasoning, better manage anger, and reduce aggressive behavior. The program consists of 10 weeks (30 sessions) of intervention training, and is divided into three components—social skills training, anger-control training, and training in moral reasoning. Clients attend a one-hour session in each of these components each week. Incremental learning, reinforcement techniques, and guided group discussions enhance skill acquisition and reinforce the lessons in the curriculum. The ART program targets decreases in conduct problem behaviors, improvements in prosocial behaviors, and improvements in levels of moral reasoning.

Botvin Life Skills Training (LST). LST is an evidence-based substance abuse and violence prevention program that is uniquely designed to be flexible and interactive. The program can be taught either on an intensive schedule (two to three times a week) until the program is complete, or on a more extended schedule (once a week until the program is complete). Both formats have proven to be effective. The LST High School program comprises 10 class sessions.

Target population

The JAG program focuses on two key strategies with distinct target populations. The first strategy targets disadvantaged youth served through local community centers and non-profit

¹ Hossfeld, B. (2017) Grant Writers Template: A guide for those seeking funding for Girl's Circle & The Council for Boys and Young Men models. One Circle Foundation.

organizations serving Redding, Anderson and surrounding communities. The second strategy focuses on providing rehabilitative services to youth in custody in juvenile detention settings.

Local Management and JAG Steering Committee

As the lead agency, the Shasta County Probation Department has responsibility for management and oversight of the JAG grant program. The Probation Department has also established a Local JAG Steering Committee with member representation from Shasta County Probation, the Shasta District Attorney's Office, the Shasta County Public Defender's Office, the Shasta Superior Court, the Shasta County Child Abuse Prevention Council, the Shasta County Office of Education, the Shasta County Health and Human Services Agency (HHS), local law enforcement and members of the community at large. The Steering Committee will be an active participant in the development, implementation, and oversight of the local JAG project. The steering committee was responsible for identifying community needs, priorities, and strategies and providing ongoing oversight of the project.

Evaluation Methods and Design

The evaluation of the Shasta County JAG Juvenile Prevention and Education grant will be conducted by an external evaluation firm, Evaluation, Management, and Training Associates, Inc. The evaluation contract will cover the initial year of the grant with the option to renew for the remainder of the grant funded period upon agreement by the Shasta County Probation Department and the evaluation team. EMT is a women-owned small business (WOSB) with more than 30 years of experience conducting policy and evaluation research studies in the behavioral health and criminal justice fields. EMT's mission is to promote and facilitate the use of science-based information to improve social policy and to enhance the resolution of public problems.

The proposed JAG Juvenile Prevention and Education evaluation is designed to promote program accountability and program improvement and to advance the work of key partners in achieving project goals. The evaluation plan will fulfill several key functions including: a) clearly articulating the project approach b) generating timely and relevant feedback on the implementation process to further strengthen implementation, c) testing the effectiveness of program strategies in producing meaningful changes in youth outcomes, and d) producing actionable data findings, lessons learned, and recommendations that are useful to state funders and local program staff.

The proposed program evaluation will utilize a mixed-methods design that incorporates quantitative and qualitative data elements and supports both process and outcome measurement. Evaluation activities will be implemented through a collaborative effort involving evaluation team members, Shasta County Probation, and the three community-based provider organizations (i.e., the City of Redding, the MLK Center, and Youth Options). Data collection activities will be managed locally by agency staff who will compile data from youth participants, and transfer information to the evaluation team for data cleaning, data integration, analysis, and reporting. Sources of data supporting both the process and outcome evaluation components include JAG program profiles, youth intake forms, service utilization records, pre-post youth surveys for youth participating in selected evidence-based program components, core youth participant survey, key informant interviews, and focus groups with youth in custody.

Youth Identifiers

The evaluation team will meet with Probation and local provider agencies during the evaluation planning phase to discuss options for uniquely identifying and tracking JAG program participants for evaluation and reporting purposes. Ideally, each participating youth will be assigned a unique project identifier using encryption formulas embedded in tracking spreadsheets. The participant ID number will be assigned to youth at the time of intake into the program and will be used to monitor ongoing participation in evidence-based programs and data collection activities (e.g., youth survey administrations). All names and personally identifiable information (PII) will be removed from tracking spreadsheets prior transferring data to the evaluation team to ensure privacy and confidentiality of data.

Process Evaluation Questions and Data Sources

The purpose of the process evaluation is to assess how program activities are being implemented in accordance with the stated program goals and objectives. Process indicators will include the unduplicated number of youth participants served by project location, the number of youth actively participating in individual funded program components, the number of sessions implemented, and the number and percentage of youth who complete programs with fidelity to the program model.

The **process evaluation** will describe and assess the quality of program implementation and fidelity to the evidence-based program models that are implemented in community and detention settings. The process evaluation component incorporates a variety of activities including articulating the program logic, documenting differences between the “program-as-planned” and the “program-as-implemented”, identifying strengths, challenges and needs for improvement, and gauging youth and stakeholder perspectives. The process evaluation serves several purposes including determining how well programs are functioning, identifying program elements that contribute to success or failure, supporting the interpretation of outcome findings, and providing decision making feedback to stakeholder agencies. The process evaluation is designed to answer the following six process evaluation questions:

- How many unduplicated youths were reached through JAG prevention and education services countywide and by funded Bureau of Justice Assistance program type (i.e., educational, job skills, juvenile delinquency, pro-social), and specific program component?
- What were the characteristics of youth who participated in JAG prevention and education services (e.g., age, geographic location, school, race/ethnic characteristics) by program setting (e.g. school, community, or detention setting)?
- How many prevention and intervention sessions were delivered by Probation staff and providers, by BJA program type (i.e., educational, job skills, juvenile delinquency, pro-social), and by specific program component?
- To what extent were evidence-based programs implemented with fidelity, and to what extent did youth complete program components with the recommended dosage?
- What were the most significant challenges or barriers to implementing the JAG grant program as perceived by key partners and other project stakeholders?

-
- What were the most significant accomplishments of the JAG grant program as perceived by key partners and other project stakeholders?

The process evaluation will utilize data from several key sources, including the following:

JAG program profiles. Each year of the grant, sub-contracted provider agencies will complete a program profile for each JAG funded component implemented at their service location. The program profile will document the program name, the lead staff responsible for implementation, the anticipated number of youths to be served, the target population, the method of outreach and recruitment, the program structure, and the planned dates of implementation. Profiles will be reviewed on a quarterly basis and updated as needed.

Youth intake. Youth who participate in JAG funded prevention and education services will be asked to complete a standard intake form with basic demographic and contact information. Information from youth intake forms will be used to document the reach of program services (i.e., number of participants) and the characteristics of the youth service population. Youth intake information will be transferred to the evaluation team for quarterly analysis and reporting with personally identifying information (PII) removed.

Service utilization records. Service and referral data will be recorded for each participant encounter and logged in program implementation tracking forms. Service utilization data will be recorded by program staff and transferred electronically to the evaluation team on a quarterly basis. Information will be used to monitor the number of individuals receiving services and the number of sessions delivered by program type and component.

Fidelity assessment. Information on individual program dosage and retention and attrition rates will be calculated to assess fidelity to the evidence-based program models. Fidelity assessment measures the degree to which interventions are implemented as theoretically planned. The effectiveness of an intervention cannot be tested if the intervention failed to be implemented. Stronger fidelity to the program model increases confidence that changes in outcomes can be attributed to prevention strategies.

Key informant interviews. The evaluation team will also conduct semi-structured telephone interviews with project stakeholders, including Probation staff, and staff with Youth Options, the MLK Center, and the Anderson Teen Center. Interviews will be conducted at two timepoints during the project period—mid-year through the second year of implementation to inform continuous quality improvement and at the conclusion of the project period to inform final evaluation reporting. Interview responses will be coded using Atlas.ti qualitative software to identify challenges and barriers to implementation, program accomplishments, lessons learned, and areas in need for refinement. The analysis will identify core themes and quotes to support and enhance interpretation of quantitative findings.

Outcome Evaluation Questions and Data Sources

The **outcome evaluation** provides measurement of critical outcomes that are linked to the program intervention and are often reflected in the stated goals of the program. The purpose of the outcome evaluation is to determine the program's effectiveness in achieving desired changes in knowledge, attitudes (e.g., levels of engagement, positive orientations toward

school), and risk behaviors (e.g., alcohol and drug use, aggression) targeted by the program. The outcome evaluation will be used to answer the following four key outcome evaluation questions:

- Did youth who participated in JAG programs and activities in the community value opportunities for positive youth engagement and perceive benefits from their participation?
- Were there any positive changes in knowledge, attitudes, or behaviors associated with risk for juvenile system involvement (e.g., alcohol and drug use, aggression, moral reasoning)?
- Did youth who participated in JAG programs and activities in juvenile detention settings value opportunities for intervention and perceive benefits from their participation?
- Did youth participants in JAG funded programs and services show decreases in rate of reentry into the juvenile justice system over the three-year grant period as compared to historical baseline rates?

The outcome evaluation will utilize data from three key sources.

Youth Pre-Post Surveys. Youth who participate in evidence-based programs, including TND, Botvin's Life Skills Training, Girls Circle, Boys Council or ART, will complete validated pre-post outcome surveys to measure positive changes in risk and protective factors associated with each intervention. The evaluation team will produce scannable pre-post survey measures for each program component. Surveys will be administered on the program start-date and again at the conclusion of the program session. Matched pre-post surveys will be returned to the evaluation team and will be scanned into an electronic file format and transferred to the evaluation team upon completion of each intervention.

Youth Core Outcome Survey. All youth attending at least one JAG funded program component during the funded contract year will be administered the core youth survey form via text message. The evaluation team will use QuestionPro Short Message (SMS) survey software to text survey questionnaires to youth based on information captured on intake forms. The evaluation team will facilitate a series of meetings with Probation and provider agencies to refine the youth core survey to ensure reliable and valid measurement of targeted goals and objectives and perceived benefits of participation in center-based activities.

Focus groups. The evaluation team will conduct small focus group discussions with youth in detention settings to gauge their feedback on intervention components, including the de-escalation room, fine arts therapy program, and in-custody sports program. The proposed approach to conducting focus groups discussions is based on a systematic participatory strategy that not only captures stakeholders' ideas, but also engages participants in a ranking activity to identify themes. This allows for the interpretation of focus group findings to be guided, in part, by participant perceptions. The approach is based on the nominal group technique (a consensus building strategy) discussed in the needs assessment literature by leading evaluators Witkin and Altschuld.³ Participants are invited to brainstorm

³ Witkin, B. R. & Altschuld, J. W. (1995). *Planning and Conducting Needs Assessments: A Practical Guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

responses to a short number of focus group questions (2-3 questions) at the beginning of the session. Participants are then asked to share one response each, in turn, until all ideas have been shared. Participants may choose not to participate. This strategy for brainstorming is effective because it allows participants to focus individually on what they think before hearing others' ideas. This almost always results in a greater diversity of ideas that are better formulated than if a discussion-only format is utilized. The individual sharing of ideas also fosters involvement by more participants and helps to avoid instances where a few individuals dominate the group discussion. The facilitator or notetaker records each idea on white poster paper until all ideas have been shared. Once all participant responses have been recorded, participants are given a set of stickers. Participants then use these stickers to endorse their favorite brainstormed ideas by placing stickers on the white paper. The facilitator identifies the most and engages the participants in a final discussion of why they felt some ideas were ranked the higher than others and to offer opportunities for further elaboration. The advantages to this systematic focus group approach are that the perspectives of the participants are emphasized through the brainstorming and ranking, as well as the more nuanced interpretation of why ideas were ranked high or low. EMT staff may record focus group discussions with authorization from the Probation Department and the permission of group participants and will transmit recordings to an external provider for transcription. Information from the focus groups transcriptions will be analyzed using Atlas.ti qualitative software application and will be integrated with quantitative findings from the group ranking activities. Key findings from the focus group discussions will be summarized at the group level and will be integrated into mid-year and annual evaluation reporting.

Data Use Agreement and Data Transfer

EMT will enter into data sharing agreements with the Shasta County Probation Department, Youth Options, and the Shasta County Child Abuse Prevention Coordinating Council to facilitate the transfer of data between the evaluation team and partner agencies. As part of the evaluation planning phase, the evaluation team will work closely with partner agencies to assess data availability and data collection and data entry procedures to streamline data collection systems, minimize data burden, and ensure that data systems are configured to support reporting mandates.

Data will be transferred to the evaluation team using WinSCP Secure File Transfer Protocol (SFTP). This protocol encrypts the data transferred to the FTP server and prevents unauthorized access during the operation. Data will be password protected using a unique single-use password prior to transfer and data will be removed from the SFTP site once the transfer of records is complete. Data will be stored on a secure server and will only be kept for the duration of the project period, at which point it will be destroyed. Hard copies interview notes and survey forms with identifying information will be stored in a locked filing cabinet at EMT offices.

The evaluation team will merge participant data across multiple data sources using the JAG unique client ID. This process will allow the evaluation team to link youth intake information with services utilization records, and pre-post survey forms. No individual-level, identifiable data will be reported.

Data Management and Analysis

The evaluation team utilizes the R software environment for data cleaning, statistical computing, and standard report generation. The data cleaning process will focus on identifying duplicate records, merging data across sources, exploring missing data patterns and logical inconsistencies, and configuring data for analysis and reporting. As part of the data cleaning and validation process, the evaluation team will document any questions that arise and will communicate with partner agencies to achieve resolution.

Both descriptive and inferential statistics will be used to analyze quantitative data and address the process and outcome evaluation questions. Basic univariate descriptive statistics will be used to assess data validity and reliability and to profile the youth population participating in JAG program services. Multivariate statistics such as cross tabulations, Chi-square, regression, and ANOVA analyses will be used to examine associations between JAG services and outcomes. Each EBP provides recommended corresponding pre-post evaluation surveys which will be distributed to all youth participating in each specific EBP. Paired sample t-tests will be used to determine if the youth who participated in these programs experienced any significant changes upon completion of the program. The final analysis approach will be determined based on the availability and quality of data obtained, and the most rigorous analysis technique feasible given data constraints.

The evaluation team will use Atlas.ti qualitative software program to review and code qualitative data findings to respond to evaluation questions. Findings will be analyzed to identify concrete themes and patterns in the data that may have implications for process and outcome measurement. Qualitative data will be used to enhance interpretation of quantitative findings.

Logic Model

The Shasta County Probation JAG Prevention and Education Program logic model provides a tool for mapping the relationships between program strategies and activities and their intended outcomes. The JAG Prevention and Education Program logic model is structured to provide measurement of program outputs, and short-term and long-term outcomes associated with JAG program implementation. The detailed JAG program logic model is included as Attachment A: Shasta County Probation Department JAG Program Logic Model. *Outputs* measure the number of unduplicated youths served countywide and by program location, program type, and program component, and the number of units of services delivered. *Short-term outcomes* include the number and percentage of youth who complete evidence-based programs, the number of programs that are implemented with fidelity, and the number and percentage of youth who perceive positive benefits from their participation in JAG funded programs and services. The *long-term program outcomes* include changes in risk and protective factors that mediate delinquent or criminal behavior and prevent entry or reentry into the juvenile justice system.

Evaluation Timeline

The evaluation of the Shasta County Probation Department JAG Juvenile Prevention and Education grant will be implemented over a three-year timeframe that corresponds to the duration of the grant funded period. The evaluation subcontract agreement with EMT Associates, Inc. was executed on December 18, 2019 marking the start of the evaluation

timeline. The evaluation effort will extend through the submission of the final evaluation report due on December 31, 2022.

The project will proceed according to the four phases of evaluation activities, including evaluation planning, data collection, analysis, and reporting. Specific tasks and timelines are shown in Attachment B: Shasta County Probation Department JAG Program Evaluation Timeline. The evaluation timeline is designed to correspond to the reporting requirements outlined by BSCC. Specific evaluation deliverables include the following:

Local evaluation plan. The current evaluation plan was drafted in December 2019 and will be submitted to Shasta County Probation for review and comment in advance of the submission deadline. The evaluation team will incorporate stakeholder feedback and will finalize the evaluation plan document for submission to BSCC by December 31, 2019.

Quarterly reporting. The quarterly reporting process will be used to demonstrate progress toward achievement of project goals and objectives and will demonstrate that funds are being spent in accordance with the grant award agreement. The evaluation team will coordinate with Shasta County Probation, the Shasta County Child Abuse Prevention Council, and Youth Options to integrate source data for completing the *programs* section of the required JAG quarterly reporting format including types of prevention and education programs implemented and numbers of participants served.

Final evaluation report. The final evaluation report will be submitted by December 31, 2022. The purpose of the Final Local Evaluation Report is to determine whether the overall project and its individual components were effective in meeting proposed program goals. The report will be structured to include program background, the current logic model, a description of the methodology and study limitations, results from both the process and outcome evaluation components, and a summary of lessons learned, conclusions, and recommendations. The evaluation team will prepare a brief, executive summary that highlights major findings from the evaluation to disseminate to project stakeholders and other key audiences. Findings from the final evaluation report will also be summarized in a brief PowerPoint presentation to be presented to the local JAG advisory committee.

Attachment A. Shasta County Probation JAG Program Logic Model

Inputs	Strategies/Activities	Outputs	Short-Term Outcomes	Long-Term Outcomes	Potential Impact
<p>Program Staff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shasta County Probation Department City of Redding 	<p>Towards No Drugs (TND) & Botvin Life Skills (LST)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement evidence-based substance abuse and violence prevention programs in community settings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of youth participants Total sessions delivered 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence-based program models implemented with fidelity Percent of youth completing EBP model Percent of youth reporting positive perceptions of program quality and staffing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delayed onset or reduced 30-day alcohol and drug use (pre-post) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased school attachment and educational attainment. Increased employability and self-sufficiency. Decreased rates of entry or reentry into the juvenile justice system.
<p>Youth Violence Prevention Council of Shasta County (Youth Options Shasta)</p>	<p>Boys Council & Girls Circle</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement evidence-based social skills and behavioral intervention programs in community settings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of youth participants Total sessions delivered 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence-based program models implemented with fidelity Percent of youth completing EBP model Percent of youth reporting positive perceptions of program quality and staffing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased school attachment (Pre-post) Increased social competence (Pre-post) Reduced problem behaviors (Pre-post) Percent of youth reporting positive impacts on risk behavior. 	
<p>Funding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant 	<p>Aggression Replacement Training (ART)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement evidence-based cognitive-behavioral intervention program in community settings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of youth participants Total sessions delivered 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence-based program models implemented with fidelity Percent of youth completing EBP model Percent of youth reporting positive perceptions of program quality and staffing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased social competence (Pre-post) Improved anger management (Pre-post) Reduced aggressive behavior (Pre-post) Percent of youth self-reporting positive impacts on risk behavior. 	
<p>Evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> EMT Associates, Inc. 	<p>Education and Job Skills</p> <p>Implement education support and job skills training programs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Daily tutoring, mentorship, and educational support TWIST Youth Tech Life skills/independent living Financial literacy, college visits, job training scholarships 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of youth participants Total sessions delivered 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percent of youth reporting positive perceptions of program quality and staffing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percent of youth self-reporting positive impacts on risk behavior. 	

Project Game Plan

- Implement community sports programs in school settings.

- Number of youth participants
- Total sessions delivered

- Percent of youth reporting positive perceptions of program quality and staffing.

- Percent of youth self-reporting positive impacts on behavioral functioning.

Rehabilitative Interventions

Implement rehabilitative services and interventions in youth detention settings

- Multi-sensory de-escalation room
- Fine arts therapy
- In-custody sports program

- Number of youth participants
- Total sessions delivered

- Percent of youth reporting positive perceptions of program quality and staffing.

- Percent of youth self-reporting positive impacts on behavioral functioning.
- Reduced rates of reentry into the criminal justice system.

