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

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

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

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