

DATE: May 28, 2010

TO: Councilmember Tim Burgess
Chair, Public Safety and Education Committee

FROM: Mariko Lockhart, Director
Seattle Youth Violence Prevention Initiative

CC: Darryl Smith, Deputy Director, Office of the Mayor
Peter Harris, Legislative

RE: Response to SLI

Tab	Action	Option	Version
102	1	A	2

Budget Action Title: DON: Evaluation of Youth Violence Prevention Initiative

(a) Explain whether each element will replicate a model shown to be effective elsewhere, or will be evaluated by local evidence of effectiveness, or both.

Element	Model Replication	Evaluated Locally
Case Management		X
Mentoring	X	X
Aggression Replacement Training	X	X
Youth Employment		X
Extended Hours programming		X
Neighborhood Matching Fund Projects		X
Sustaining Projects		X
School Emphasis Officers	X	X
Street Outreach	X	X

(b) If the approach includes replication, explain the model and how it will be applied. Explain how fidelity to the model will be achieved and tested. Based on the magnitude of the effects shown by the model, explain the likely effects that successful replication would achieve in Seattle.

The Seattle Youth Violence Prevention Initiative includes some strategies that replicate research-based models that have proven effective.

Big Brothers Big Sisters (BBBS): BBBS has been rated a “Model” program by Blueprints for Violence Prevention, a project of the Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence at the University of Colorado. The Blueprints mission is to identify truly outstanding violence and drug prevention programs that meet a high scientific standard of effectiveness. In doing so, Blueprints serves as a resource for governments, foundations, businesses, and other organizations trying to make informed judgments about their investments in violence and drug prevention programs.

By selecting BBBS as one of two agencies providing mentoring services, the SYVPI ensures that the rigorous published standards and required procedures are being implemented. Despite the assurance of fidelity to the evidence-based model, the Initiative will also measure the results of the mentoring component. The standards and procedures include:

- *Orientation* is required for all volunteers.
- *Volunteer Screening* includes a written application, a background check, an extensive interview, and a home assessment; it is designed to screen out those who may inflict psychological or physical harm, lack the capacity to form a caring bond with the child, or are unlikely to honor their time commitments.
- *Youth Assessment* involves a written application, interviews with the child and the parent, and a home assessment; it is designed to help the caseworker learn about the child in order to make the best possible match, and also to secure parental permission.
- *Matches* are carefully considered and based upon the needs of the youth, abilities of volunteers, preferences of the parent, and the capacity of program staff.
- *Supervision* is accomplished via an initial contact with the parent, youth, and volunteer within two weeks of the match; monthly telephone contact with the volunteer, parent and/or youth during the first year; and quarterly contact with all parties for the duration of the match.

An evaluation of the Big Brothers Big Sisters of America program has been conducted nationally to assess children who participated in BBBSA compared to their non-participating peers. After an eighteen month period, BBBSA youth:

- Were 46% less likely than control youth to initiate drug use during the study period.
- Were 27% less likely to initiate alcohol use than control youth.
- **Were almost one-third less likely than control youth to hit someone.**
- Were better than control youth in academic behavior, attitudes, and performance.
- Were more likely to have higher quality relationships with their parents or guardians than control youth.
- Were more likely to have higher quality relationships with their peers at the end of the study period than did control youth.

For purposes of the SYVPI, we will be looking at discipline data from the middle schools these students attend and their own disciplinary record to assess reduction in violent behavior. This will correlate most closely to the BBBS effect highlighted in the third bullet above and we anticipate a similar result compared to the control group in BBBSA study. Additionally, the evaluation of this component will be informed by a Gates-funded on-going statewide evaluation of the effects of mentoring on higher risk youth (like those served by the SYVPI).

Aggression Replacement Training (ART): ART has been evaluated in numerous comprehensive studies, using solid evaluation designs, psychometrics, and data analysis techniques. Based on the rigor of evaluation, ART has been categorized as an evidence-based intervention and has been replicated in multiple settings and with multiple populations across the world. The strict commitment to quality assurance and fidelity to the model provides those who administer the training with a common strategy that can be measured with the same universal outcomes. In Washington, ART was added as one of the four evidence-based programs implemented due to the 1997 Community Justice Accountability Act.

ART implementation requires the use of certified facilitators and a Quality Assurance Consultant to ensure fidelity to the model. These requirements are included in the contract for ART with the service provider, Southwest Youth and Family Services.

SYVPI's adaptation of ART from institutionalized residential settings for which a strong research base exists to community-based settings has been documented along with the reasons for doing so. Similar to other cities implementing ART in community and non-residential school-based settings, SYVPI has encountered additional challenges related to the adaptation to non-institutionalized settings related to attendance and attrition. To correctly identify the magnitude of the effect, an evaluation component would seek to identify evaluations of ART in similar settings.

Street Outreach

The Street Outreach component was included in SYVPI after reviewing its effectiveness in cities such as Chicago, Baltimore, Boston and Washington, D.C. The model Seattle selected was the Gang Intervention Partnership (GIP) led by the Columbia Heights /Shaw Collaborative in Washington, D.C. Different from GIP's focus on gang members, however, SYVPI focuses on youth at risk of committing violence or being a victim of violence that may include gang members. Its focus is not solely on gangs. Additionally, the support and services available to the youth in the Initiative in Seattle are much more robust and comprehensive than GIP's with the exception of the family support component offered by Columbia Heights/Shaw Collaborative.

The Center for Youth Policy Research, who evaluated the GIP program in 2006, identified critical components:

GIP's Goals

GIP's primary goal is to eliminate or significantly reduce gang-related homicides and other forms of gang-related violence in the Columbia Heights / Shaw neighborhoods. Specifically, GIP's goals are to:

1. Reduce incidence of gang-related violence in Ward 1.
2. Decrease gang-membership and stop the proliferation of new gangs operating in the target area.
3. Reduce the number of gang-related suspensions in targeted schools.
4. Increase the involvement of at-risk youth in recreational and other productive activities.

GIP's Core Strategies and Activities

The Partnership was founded on five core strategies:

1. Conduct intensive and targeted police work and build strong police/community partnerships.
2. Provide targeted outreach to gang-related youth and their family members.
3. Educate parents and community members.
4. Improve and expand access to services critical to diversion and family strengthening.
5. Build capacity.

Five activities have guided GIP's implementation:

1. Weekly meetings.
2. Use of a critical incident emergency protocol.
3. Involvement of targeted outreach teams including street-based outreach.
4. Cool Down group.
5. Reduce gang-related school suspensions.

The SYVPI's goals are aligned with GIP's in the focus on reducing violence and school suspensions and increasing the involvement of targeted youth in recreational and other productive activities. The SYVPI's core strategies also mirror GIP's through 1) a collaboration with the Seattle Police Department who have increased their gang unit by adding a day squad; 2) formation of a street outreach team that has trained with GIP's; 3) extensive community outreach to parents and community members; 4) services such as case management, mentoring, employment, and extended hours with youth-designed programming at community centers, among others for targeted youth; and 5) building community capacity through the Neighborhood Networks. Finally, the activities guiding GIP's implementation have been adopted by the street outreach team.

According to the evaluation, GIP's impressive record in decreasing gang activity in the target area is the result of a constellation of several factors rather than any single component. These factors include:

1. The commitment of the Mayor and City Council to provide funding, personnel assignments, and inter-governmental advocates necessary to create an effective and comprehensive network of communication, coordination, and strategy development among multiple partners.
2. The multi-agency, holistic approach to gang intervention developed and required by GIP that focuses on partners communicating with one another in a detailed fashion on a frequent and regular basis.
3. The commitment of the police department's gang unit to providing stable, visible and highly specialized youth outreach, gang intervention and suppression, and intelligence gathering efforts on a 24 hour per day, 7 days per week basis.
4. The dedication of the lead agency in providing program management, direct services and technical assistance in ensuring the effective delivery of the various components of the partnership.
5. The commitment of neighborhood youth-serving agencies to serving a crucial role in intervening with gang-involved youth.
6. GIP's coordinated and rapid response to all levels of incidents and monitoring of situations to prevent flare-ups.
7. The recognition that "gentrification" causes problems as well as solving problems.
8. A commitment to intolerance of continued violence as a way of life in the neighborhood.

Seattle's approach is also aligned with these factors with a focus on youth at risk of committing violence, not specifically gang violence. GIP's evaluation analyzes descriptive data from four years before GIP implementation and three years after and does not disaggregate the effects of single components of the effort.

School Emphasis Officers (SEO)

The SYVPI employs School Emphasis Officers in four middle schools in the focus neighborhoods. The SEO role is most commonly known by the name of School Resource Officers or SROs in other districts throughout the country. SROs have four primary responsibilities: 1) act as a liaison between the school, community and police; 2) teach law-related education classes; 3) counsel students; and, 4) perform law enforcement duties.

The School Emphasis Officer program in Seattle is modeled on the National Association of School Safety and Law Enforcement Officers (NASSLEO). NASSLEO is the oldest organization of its type and is dedicated to providing professional information, training and other resources available to school districts and law enforcement agencies across the nation and Canada. NASSLEO's primary mission is to bring together people that are joined in a common effort to make schools safe for students and staff. This model of school based officers does not include counseling in the officers' job description which distinguishes it from the National Association of School Resource Officers (NASRO).

Available research is limited on whether School Resource Officers (SROs) make schools safer. Most studies of this topic rely primarily on survey data of school staff and administrators, parents, students and SROs.

The Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services (2001), using content analyses of reports submitted from 78 SRO programs in the state, determined that SROs were effective in reducing school crime. Over one in three (37.2%) SROs and four in five (82%) staff stated that there had been a reduction in fighting at the school where the SROs served since their arrival.

The Center for Prevention of School Violence (CPSV) in North Carolina also conducted a statewide analysis of the effectiveness of SROs (CPSV, 2001). Evidence from teachers, administrators, students and discipline data suggested that SROs positively affect school climate; make the school safer; are effective teachers, counselors and law enforcers; and reduce the number of firearms on school property (CPSV, 2001).

I.M. Johnson, whose study of the impact of an SRO program on school violence and school disciplinary programs in a southern city, published in the *Journal of Criminal Justice* (1999), found that fighting, gang activity, drug possession, and other minor and major offenses decreased after SROs were assigned to the schools.

The evaluation of the Seattle SEO component of the SYVPI will use middle school disciplinary data to analyze incidence of suspensions and expulsions related to violence before assignment of the SEOs and after. Additionally, pending necessary disclosure of information forms from students, disciplinary data of Initiative-enrolled youth before and after assignment of the SEO will be used.

(c) If the approach includes collecting local evidence on effectiveness, explain what data will be collected, how they will be collected, and how they will be analyzed.

From the Seattle Police Department, we anticipate gathering the initial data outlined in the following chart. Acquisition of data on Initiative-enrolled youth is dependent on the establishment of a Memorandum of Understanding allowing for this data to be shared while maintaining confidentiality of the information. SPD arrest data will be analyzed to determine how youth enrolled in the Initiative and living in Initiative neighborhoods fared compared to youth in the city at large with respect to violent crimes with and without a firearm, homicides and victims of violence. To the extent possible, the performance of enrolled youth will be compared to those who were referred but did not enroll, and to those who enrolled but exited from services without completion. Additionally, the data will be used to determine how Initiative-enrolled youth fared before enrollment and afterward, in order to determine change in behavior. This data will be collected periodically to compare trends over time.

SPD Data on Juvenile Violent Crime

	Base Year	Time Period 1	Time Period 2
VIOLENT CRIMES			
Number of violent crimes* in Initiative neighborhoods	Base year	% Change	% Change
Number of violent crimes in Seattle	Base year	% Change	% Change
JUVENILE VIOLENT CRIMES			
Number of juvenile violent crimes in Initiative Neighborhoods	Base year	% Change	% Change
Number of juvenile violent crimes in Seattle	Base year	% Change	% Change
Number of violent crimes committed by Initiative youth	Base year	% Change	% Change
JUVENILE CRIMES WITH FIREARM			
Number juvenile crimes with firearm	Base year	% Change	% Change
Number Initiative youth arrested for crimes with firearm	Base year	% Change	% Change
YOUTH VICTIMS OF VIOLENCE			
Number of youth victims of violence in Seattle	Base year	% Change	% Change
Number of youth victims of violence in three neighborhoods	Base year	% Change	% Change
YOUTH HOMICIDES			
Number youth killed in Seattle	Base year	% Change	% Change
Number youth killed in 3 neighborhoods	Base year	% Change	% Change
Number of youth killed from 3 neighborhoods	Base year	% Change	% Change

*Violent Crimes – from list in Appendix B

From King County Juvenile Court, we anticipate gathering the initial data outlined in the following chart. Acquisition of data on Initiative-enrolled youth is dependent on securing a court order or other mechanism allowing for this data to be shared while maintaining confidentiality of the information. Juvenile Court data will be analyzed to determine how youth enrolled in the Initiative fared compared to overall juvenile court referrals. To the extent possible, the performance of enrolled youth will be compared to those who were referred but did not enroll, and to those who enrolled but exited from services without completion. The data will also be used to determine how they fared before enrollment in the Initiative and afterward, in order to determine change in behavior. This data will be collected periodically to compare trends over time

King County Juvenile Court Data on Referrals for Violent Crimes

	Base year	Time Period 1	Time Period 2
REFERRALS FOR VIOLENT CRIMES			
Number of juvenile court referrals	Base year	% Change	% Change
Number of Initiative youth referred	Base year	% Change	% Change

Additionally, data will be collected on all of the investment areas based on the indicators that have been identified to measure their effectiveness. For the year 2010, the following indicators have been identified for the SYVPI investment areas.

Referral, Intake and Screening

Indicators	2010 Planned Target
Total number of youth referred who are SYVPI priority populations	440
85% of eligible youth complete the Intake and Screening process (as evidenced by agreeing to and signing off on the goals established for youth/family)	374
80% of eligible youth are still engaged in services at 3 months.	299
70% of eligible youth are still engaged in services at 6 months.	262
60% of eligible youth are still engaged in services at 12 months.	224

Case Management

Indicators	2010 Planned Target
Number of youth served in the SYVPI Network Neighborhoods	385
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fulfillment of probation or community services requirements • Reduction of discipline referrals, suspensions and/or expulsions • Reduction of criminal referrals, admissions, detention days • Reduction in gang-related behavior or exit from gang 	212
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete GED/Graduate • Progress to the next grade level, or graduate from high school • Increase quarterly school attendance 	231
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Successful completion in a treatment program such as substance abuse, mental health, family counseling, etc. • Enrollment and participation in a community service program in the areas of recreation, music, arts, dance, sports, etc. • Number of youth engaged in service for six months/one year without restrictions or sanctions related to violent behavior 	231

Aggression Replacement Training

Indicators	2010 Planned Target
Total number of youth referred	128
75% of youth who are referred to ART enroll	96
75% of enrolled participants attended 70% of ART training	72
70% of participants increase in Pro-Social Skills	67
70% of participants increase positive behaviors and moral reasoning	67
70% of participants increase self efficacy	67
90% of participants learn alternatives to aggression	86

Youth Employment

Indicators	2010 Planned Target
Number of youth served in the Network Neighborhoods	225
Number/percentage (88%) of youth completing the program (internship, community project, etc.)	197
Number/percentage (80%) of youth who report to internship or job readiness training activity at least 85% of the days they are scheduled to do so.	178
Number/percentage of youth who are punctual to internship or job readiness training activity at least 85% of the time	178
Number/percentage of youth who receive positive performance evaluations regarding work relationships and/or interpersonal behaviors	177
Number/percentage of youth who are evaluated as demonstrating “good” or “excellent” job competency skills by end of internship or group project	177
Number/percentage of youth who obtain unsubsidized employment	24

Mentoring

Indicators	2010 Planned Target
Number of youth participating in mentoring	113
85% of matches spend 2 hours together per week	96
75% of matches last 3 months (Includes 9 matches made during the last quarter of 2009 and 95 projected matches to be made the end of the 3 rd quarter of 2010)	78
50% of matches last 12 months (Based on the 13 matches that were made by the end of 2009.)	7

At the network level, youth will be engaged in multiple activities. Indicators will, as a result, be less specific but will measure the youth’s commitment to change, increasing commitment to engage in pro-social activities, prolonged engagement in network activities, and finally, a prolonged period of time without engaging in violence.

The following network indicators will be tracked as evidence of progress toward meeting the adopted outcomes:

1. Total number of youth contacted who are SYVPI priority populations
2. Number of Youth/Family completing intake and assessment (as evidenced by agreeing to and signing off on participation in recommended services for youth/family)
3. Number of youth still engaged in network recommended services at three months without restrictions or sanctions related to violent behavior
4. Number of case managed youth achieving goals established in plan at three months
5. Number of youth still engaged in network recommended services at six months
6. Number of case managed youth achieving goals established in plan at six months
7. Number of youth engaged in recommended services for six months without restrictions or sanctions related to violent behavior
8. Number of youth engaged in increased number of recommended services at one year
9. Number of case managed youth achieving goals established in plan at one year

10. Number of youth engaged in recommended services for one year without restrictions or sanctions related to violent behavior

Specific performance targets for each of the three Networks have been established as follows:

Performance Commitments	Targets 2009	Targets 2010
1) Number of Youth/Family completing intake and assessment as evidenced by agreeing to and signing off on the goals established for youth/family	144	125
2) Number of youth still engaged in services at three months	63	100
3) Number of youth still engaged in services at six months		87
4) Number of youth a still engaged in services at twelve months		30

Database

To collect local evidence on effectiveness the SYVPI is contracting for the development of a linked data system for three types of uses including direct case management, performance assessment and reporting on outcomes and evaluation.

Intake staff, case managers and service providers must have the capability to track use of services by youth and monitor changes in behavior. Certain levels of data will be shared so that staff involved with a youth will have better knowledge of the types of services used across systems and whether they are having the intended effect on the youth. Network coordinators, city staff and service providers will be able to aggregate data to see how well important milestones and indicators are being met. Course corrections for programs will be based on the results of this performance review. The data system will also support determining the extent to which outcomes have been met, and to evaluate the ways in which various components of the SYVPI contributed to outcomes. Changes in overall investment strategies will be based on this use of data.

There will be an annual report to the citizens and stakeholders showing the outcomes achieved by the SYVPI, highlighting individual program outcomes, suggesting course corrections and including next steps. The Initiative Director will report to the City Council on at least a quarterly basis.

Comparison City

The SYVPI is intended to change not only the behavior of enrolled youth, but to have a broader effect on violence in the community. By focusing on youth who have shown a propensity to engage in delinquency, we expect to reduce their likelihood of influencing peers to engage in violence, and to reduce acts of retaliation. For that reason, simply comparing SYVPI enrolled youth with others in their community, or with youth throughout Seattle, may give an incomplete view of the initiative’s impact. A comparison community is proposed as a means of assessing the community wide impact of the SYVPI.

The City of Seattle is a member of Urban Networks to Increase Thriving Youth (UNITY), a project of the Prevention Institute based in California and funded by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and The California Wellness Foundation. UNITY is designed to strengthen and support cities in preventing violence before it occurs and to help sustain these efforts. As a member of the UNITY network, the SYVPI has access to the technical assistance and training on evaluation of violence

prevention efforts from the Southern California Injury Prevention Research Center, UCLA School of Public Health. Billie Weiss, Director of the Research Center and her team will assist the SYVPI to identify a comparison city to be used in evaluating the effectiveness of Seattle’s Initiative.

(d) Propose a schedule for evaluation. Explain the relationship of the schedule to the timing of future decisions on continuing or revising the elements of the initiative.

	2010									2011											
	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	
EVALUATION TEAM																					
Establish Evaluation Team																					
Assign roles and tasks																					
Team Meetings																					
Define evaluation plan elements																					
Refine timeline																					
DATABASE																					
Manage Interim database																					
Execute contract with Adsystem																					
Gather data requirements																					
Project Management Plan																					
Gap Matrix																					
Initial Operating Capability (IOC) Reports (5 + Ad hoc capability)																					
IOC Interface (Primary)																					
Data Conversion																					
IOC Preview																					
Database Implementation Phase I																					
Database Implementation Phase II																					
Database Implementation Final																					
DATA COLLECTION																					
Network Coord. Indicators																					
Intake & Referral Indicators																					
Case Management Indicators																					
ART Indicators																					
Mentoring Indicators																					
Employment Indicators																					
Extended Hours Indicators																					
NMF Indicators																					

Sustaining Fund Indicators																				
SEO Indicators																				
Street Outreach Indicators																				
Establish data sharing MOU-SPD																				
Court Order for KC Court data																				
Gather aggregate juvenile referral data																				
Gather aggregate SPS data																				
COMPARISON SITE																				
Identify graduate interns (UW)																				
Collect data for Seattle profile																				
Enter into single database																				
Develop Seattle profile																				
Identify comparison site																				
Collect baseline data																				
Track comparison site data																				

The SYVPI employs ongoing assessment and course correction as a regular practice. As relevant data is available to the Initiative leadership team, it is used to assess progress and strategies. This will continue to occur on an ongoing basis. Some examples of changes that have been made based on examination of data are the following:

- 1) Change in venues for Big Brother Big Sister mentoring from school-based to site and community based. The economic downturn has negatively affected BBBS’s ability to recruit mentors for school-based mentoring as employees are less likely to receive permission to leave work on a weekly basis. Expanding the venues for BBBS to conduct mentoring has expedited the matching process while staying well within BBBS established and proven practice.
- 2) Change in venue for ART from community-based to school-based. ART has been primarily used in correctional facilities for youth where attendance is rarely an issue. Community-based implementation presented challenges of transportation and attendance. In 2010, ART is being implemented in school-based settings to reduce barriers to regular attendance.

Currently OFE is making decisions regarding cuts to programming for 2011-2012 that are not based on evaluation of their contributive value to the overall Initiative outcomes. Rather, they are based on required budgetary reductions. These fall outside of the evaluation timeline.

(e) Explain the organizational requirements for evaluation. Explain who will do what. Explain the costs.

Item	Description	In-Kind from UNITY membership	Cost
Stipend for 2 nd Year graduate student (3 10-week quarters)	UW School of Public Health graduate student to create database for Seattle profile; assist in comparison. 20hours/week x \$17/hour x 10 weeks/quarter x 3 quarters		\$10,200
Paul Hsu, Southern California Injury Prevention Research Center, UCLA School of Public Health.	Seattle Profile development oversight and guidance; identification of comparison site; selection of baseline data 72 hrs x \$150/hr	10,800	\$0
Billie Weiss, Director, Southern California Injury Prevention Research Center, UCLA School of Public Health.	Evaluation oversight and quality control. 20hrs x \$250/hr	\$5,000	\$0
Travel costs for UNITY/UCLA evaluation team to Seattle	One face-to-face planning meeting; one face-to-face mid-evaluation assessment meeting. Costs per meeting: Flight: \$219 roundtrip x 2 = \$438 Lodging: \$220.21/night for 1 night x 2 people = \$440.42 Food: (2 Breakfasts x \$20.63 + 2 Lunches x \$18.46 + 1 Dinner x \$45.06) x 2 people = \$246.48		\$1,124.48
Two conference call meetings	Two conference calls with 6 lines. \$20 set up fee + \$1 per line x 6 lines x 2 calls.		\$52
Printing & Dissemination of Evaluation Report	Primary source of dissemination will be electronic, however 50 printed copies will be printed for distribution to key stakeholders and UNITY members. 50 copies x \$6 printing/binding + 50 x \$3 postage		\$450
TOTAL COSTS		\$15,800 UNITY In-kind	\$11,826.48