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

| **#** | **Output Measure** | **Definition** | **Data Grantee Reports** | **Record Data Here** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Number and percent of intake units using valid and reliable risk assessments | Measure of program implementation. Appropriate for grantees that oversee more than one unit, department, or entity that conducts youth intake procedures. Report the raw number of units that use a risk assessment tool (with at least 80 percent of the youth they process) that has been determined through research or evaluation to be valid and reliable. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of intake units overseen by the grantee. | 1. Number of units that use a validated risk assessment tool 2. Number of units 3. Percent (A/B) |  |
|  | Number and percent of intake units using valid and reliable needs assessments | Measure of program implementation. Appropriate for grantees that oversee more than one unit, department, or entity that conducts youth intake procedures. Report the raw number of units that use a needs assessment tool (with at least 80 percent of the youth they process) that has been determined through research or evaluation to be valid and reliable. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of intake units overseen by the grantee. | 1. Number of units that use a validated needs assessment tool 2. Number of units 3. Percent (A/B) |  |
|  | Average number of sources used in assessment process | Measure of system accountability based on the idea that the more sources used, the more accurate the assessment will be. Appropriate for grantees that conduct youth assessments. Report the average number of data sources used in the assessment process (e.g., school records, parental reports, justice records, face-to-face assessments, behavioral observation). If members of a youth’s family are assessed separately, count them as different sources, but if they are interviewed together or more than one interview is required to fill in missing information, count them as one source. | 1. Average number of data sources used per youth assessment |  |
|  | Number and percent of assessment staff with specialized training | Measure of system accountability based on the idea that properly trained staff provides better service. Appropriate for grantees that conduct assessments. Report the number of staff who conduct assessments, have either received specific training about conducting assessments, or have specialized degrees or certifications (such as being Certified Addictions Specialists, or licensed social workers). Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of staff who conducts assessments. | 1. Number of assessors with specialized training 2. Number of assessors 3. Percent (A/B) |  |
|  | 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 youth fully assessed using risk and needs assessments | Measure of system accountability. Appropriate for grantees that conduct youth assessments. Report the raw number of youth to have complete assessment files (i.e., all assessments were completely administered and there are no missing data). Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of youth processed by the grantee. | 1. Number of youth with complete files 2. Number of youth 3. Percent (A/B) |  |
|  | Of the total number of youth identified as needing substance abuse treatment, the percent identified through the screening/assessment process | Measure of system accountability based on the idea that effective assessment systems will catch the majority of youth with the targeted service needs. Appropriate for grantees that use the results of youth assessments (whether or not they conduct the assessments themselves). Report the raw number of youth identified as needing substance abuse treatment through the assessment process divided by the total number of youth identified as needing substance abuse treatment. | 1. Number of youth assessed as needing substance abuse treatment 2. Number of youth identified as needing substance abuse treatment 3. Percent (A/B) |  |
|  | Of the total number of youth identified as needing mental health services, the percent identified through the screening/assessment process | Measure of system accountability based on the idea that effective assessment systems will catch the majority of youth with the targeted service needs. Appropriate for grantees that use the results of youth assessments (whether or not they conduct the assessments themselves). Report the raw number of youth identified as needing mental health treatment through the assessment process divided by the total number of youth identified as needing mental health treatment. | 1. Number of youth assessed as needing mental health treatment 2. Number of youth identified as needing mental health treatment 3. Percent (A/B) |  |
|  | Average time in hours from screening to assessment | Measure of program efficiency. Appropriate for programs that assess clients or refer clients for assessment. Report the average number of hours from youths screening being completed (i.e., all screening data being completely collected) to their assessment being completed (i.e., all assessment data being completely collected). | 1. Average number of hours from screening completion to assessment completion |  |
|  | Average time in days from assessment to first service receipt | Measure of program efficiency. Appropriate for programs that serve clients or refer clients for service. Report the average number of calendar days from youths assessment being completed (i.e., all assessment data being completely collected) to their first receipt of service. | 1. Average number of days from assessment completion to first service |  |
|  | Number and percent of referrals to primary prevention services | Measure of program operation. Appropriate for grantees that generate client referrals or oversee the referral process (e.g., a county, village, ranchero, pueblo or reservation grantee spending the funds on building accountability capacity in a probation department). Report the raw number of referrals (not individual youth) for a primary prevention service. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of referrals generated. | 1. Number of referrals for a primary prevention service 2. Number of referrals total 3. Percent (A/B) |  |
|  | Number and percent of referrals to secondary prevention services | Measure of program operation. Appropriate for grantees that generate client referrals or oversee the referral process (e.g., a county, village, ranchero, pueblo or reservation grantee spending the funds on building accountability capacity in a probation department). Report the raw number of referrals (not individual youth) for a secondary prevention service. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of referrals generated. | 1. Number of referrals for a secondary prevention service 2. Number of referrals 3. Percent (A/B) |  |
|  | Number of different service referrals per youth | Measure of program operation. Appropriate for grantees that generate client referrals or oversee the referral process (e.g., a county, village, ranchero, pueblo or reservation grantee spending the funds on building accountability capacity in a probation department). Report the average number of referrals received by program participants while they are in the program. Different programs would be those, for example, that offer different services, serve different populations, have different procedures or criteria for inclusion or operation, or are run by different people/agencies/organizations. | 1. Average number of referrals per youth |  |
|  | Average time in hours from first justice contact for current offense to youth screening | Measure of program efficiency. Appropriate for programs that screen clients or refer clients for screening. Report the average number of hours from youth entering the system (e.g., being referred to the system by their school, being arrested, etc.) to their screening being completed (i.e., all screening data being completely collected). | 1. Average number of hours from first justice contact to screening completion |  |
|  | Number and percent of times services identified through youth assessment are actually received by the assessed youth | Measure of system accountability based on the idea that if the system identifies a service need, it has the responsibility to meet that need. Appropriate for grantees that use the results of youth assessments (whether or not they conduct the assessments themselves). Report the raw number of times a youth enrolls in, or receives, a service that they were assessed as needing. Percent is the raw number divided by the total number of services that youth were assessed as needing." | 1. Number of times youth receive referred service 2. Number of services youth were assessed as needing 3. Percent (A/B) |  |
|  | Number and percent of cases assigned to alternatives to detention | To determine if the program is working as intended by actually reducing the number of cases that result in detention. Most appropriate for grantees that include detention in their list of potential sanctions. Report the raw number of program youth who were assigned to an alternative institution and who would otherwise have been assigned to detention. Percent is the raw number divided by the raw number plus the number of youth assigned to detention. | 1. Number of cases assigned to an alternative to detention 2. Number of cases assigned to detention 3. Percent (A/(B +B)) |  |
|  | Number and percent of youth who cannot receive identified services (e.g., slots full, service not provided locally) | Measure of system accountability. Appropriate for grantees that use the results of youth assessments (whether or not they conduct the assessments themselves). Report the raw number of youth who do not receive the service or treatment indicated as needed by their assessment. Percent is the raw number divided by the number of youth assessed as needing service. | 1. Number of youth that do not receive services they are assessed as needing 2. Number of youth assessed as needing services 3. Percent (A/B) |  |