

PERFORMANCE METRICS FOR ICJI, 2006

Kenna Quinet
Roger Jarjoura
Robert Brown
Thomas Stucky
Samuel Nunn
William Newby
Crystal Garcia



© 2006 Center for Urban Policy and the Environment 06-C06
342 North Senate Avenue, 3rd Floor
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-1708

PERFORMANCE METRICS FOR ICJI, 2006

March 2006

06-C06

Authors
Kenna Quinet
Roger Jarjoura
Robert Brown
Thomas Stucky
Samuel Nunn
William Newby
Crystal Garcia

Introduction	1
I. Drug and Crime Control Division.....	3
A. Residential Substance Abuse Treatment programs (RSAT), including aftercare programs. ...	3
B. National Criminal History Improvement Program (NCHIP)	4
C. Paul Coverdell Forensic Science	5
D. Drug Court Programs.....	6
E. Multi-jurisdictional Task Force (MJTF).....	7
F. Drug prosecution	9
II. Youth Services	11
A. Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC).....	11
B. Education in detention	11
C. Mental health needs of kids in juvenile justice system	12
D. Alternatives to detention.....	13
E. Quality defense	13
F. Education advocacy	14
G. Re-entry (improved transitional and aftercare programs).....	14
H. Graduated Sanctions.....	15
III. Victim Services	17
A. General (all) programs.....	17
B. Law enforcement/prosecutors (domestic violence and sexual assault) and sexual assault treatment centers	17
C. Domestic violence shelters.....	18
D. Counseling centers	18
E. Rape crisis centers	19
F. Child advocacy	19
G. Court appointed special advocates (CASAs).....	20
V. Selected Sources.....	21





Introduction

This brief presents a menu of performance measures for federal grant programs administered by the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute (ICJI). On the whole, these metrics are drawn from different sources and reflect a blend of federal requirements, the priorities of ICJI divisions, metrics from previous evaluations in the scientific literature, metrics from other criminal justice entities similar to ICJI in other states, and a sampling of current subgrantee files at ICJI. The menu offers sets of possible performance measures, from which choices can be made regarding which metrics should be applied to which programs.

Because of the variety of criminal justice programs funded by ICJI, each subgrantee is unlikely to be able to report all metrics set out below within the relevant funding stream. Depending on the nature of the program, particular metrics should be required based on ICJI staff's assessment of the objectives and desired outcomes of the programs they fund. ICJI staff will have to look closely at grant applications in order to assign good performance measures. Those measures can be selected from the lists provided within each of the major funding streams. The completion of program evaluations in the future will produce other potential performance metrics.

The menu of performance metrics is organized under the major ICJI funding streams in Drug and Crime Control, Victim Services, and Youth Services. They are further organized according to their classification as output or outcome measures. Output measures document what the program does. In general, output measures assess what the program produces, often in terms of the counts of people served or activities performed. Outcome measures document what happens as a result of the outputs. Because outputs and outcomes are sometimes difficult to distinguish, it probably makes more sense to focus on selecting appropriate metrics to assess particular subgrantees than whether a metric is defined as an output or an outcome.

Many of the metrics set out below, especially those considered outcome measures, may require the collection of information from sources other than the subgrantee (e.g., rates of recidivism for offenders completing selected programs). Requiring a substance abuse facility to report on drug tests of graduates long gone from their program might be difficult. Likewise, re-arrest rates and time to re-offending ratios will require data from other criminal justice agencies.

For all programs there will be questions about the demographics of many program participants—age, race, ethnicity, gender, education, marital status, employment status, physical and mental health, county of origin, crime information, and so forth. In this sense, all performance reports could require subgrantees to provide this information as part of their reporting responsibilities. These demographic variables are not set out specifically in the lists of metrics included below. In addition, it is likely that for most programs, ICJI will request that offenses be broken down not only by type of offense (e.g. drug or property) but also felony versus misdemeanor charges and convictions. These distinctions will be specific to ICJI priorities for various programs and the specific nature of the subgrantee proposal and can be added as needed. Likewise, any measures involving drugs will likely be refined to ask for information by type of drug. ICJI may want to consider developing a master list of drug categories to be used across programs (i.e. the same subcategories used in the MJTF form would match any questions asked for RSAT programs). Clearly, given executive priorities, meth-related questions will be included.

Finally, for some of the federal funding streams administered by ICJI, there are additional data requirements assigned to subgrantees. Specifically, JAG law enforcement subgrantees should be submitting current Uniform Crime Report data as a condition of receiving JAG funds. It is not known which or how many



JAG subgrantees are complying with this requirement. Additionally, ICJI has identified the need for adequate subgrantee program data as one of its current objectives. A key component of data collection is automation. All subgrantees should be required to address the issue of automated management information systems in their reporting responsibilities.



I. Drug and Crime Control Division

A. Residential Substance Abuse Treatment programs (RSAT), including aftercare programs.

Outputs

(Separate statistics should be reported per facility and per grant)

(Other corrections-based substance abuse treatment programs could use these metrics as well.):

1. Number of new offenders:
 - a. Screened for entry into program
 - b. Clinically assessed
 - c. Entering program
2. Previously-funded RSAT beds continued during grant cycle
3. Number of new treatment beds added
4. Treatment beds funded through other sources
5. Number and percent of offenders:
 - a. Continuing program from previous funding (for continuation grants)
 - b. Who dropped out of program (include length of participation for each)
 - c. Terminated (by facility) from the program and length of participation
 - d. Funded through other sources (include a description of those sources)
6. Number of baseline assessments of offender's social and psychological functioning
7. Number, type, and length of program services broken down by:
 - a. Medical care
 - b. Drug counseling
 - c. Counseling for emotional/behavioral problems
 - d. Aftercare services
 - e. Other services
8. Number of days of care provided per each offender, length of stay/participation
9. Average length of stay (in days) for those completing program
10. Average cost per day per offender per program
11. Regarding drug tests performed during RSAT and Aftercare:
 - a. Number of drug tests performed on all offenders
 - b. Number and percentage of positive drug tests
12. Number of referrals to or formal written partnerships with participating agencies
13. If a training component is part of the program:
 - a. number and type of education or training programs



- b. number of offenders educated/trained
- c. number of criminal justice personnel educated/trained
- d. number of hours spent on training and education per participant (offender and agency personnel)

Outcomes

1. Number of offenders
 - a. successfully completing program
 - b. remaining drug-free during residential program
 - c. remaining drug-free during aftercare program
2. Aftercare changes in nature of substance abuse (e.g., frequency, types of drug)
3. Changes in social and psychological functioning from RSAT to Aftercare
4. Number of offenders completing program who have:
 - a. Post-RSAT release drug arrests (type of drug arrest and time to re-arrest)
 - b. Post-RSAT release non-drug arrests, (type of arrest and time to re-arrest)
5. Number and type of program violations and characteristics of violators
6. Post-release drug use (self and subgrantee reported)
7. Number of offenders with post RSAT release returns to jail or prison
8. Employment status of all participants
9. Number of offenders in paid employment and average number of days in paid employment
10. Average number of days in school or training program
11. Number participating in school or vocational training
12. Number of offenders on public assistance and type of assistance
13. Number of offenders absconding from Aftercare
14. Number of services offenders had contact with
15. If training is part of outputs: number and percent of community members, staff, non-program personnel and offenders with increased knowledge from training and educational programs

B. National Criminal History Improvement Program (NCHIP)

Outputs

1. Type of criminal history information available
2. Number of agencies or jurisdictions using the system
3. Number of searches of criminal history databases (e.g., NCIC queries)
4. Number of updates supplied to criminal history databases
5. Training provided by system
6. Number of personnel solely dedicated to NCHIP efforts



7. Number of consultants contracted for services, description
8. Equipment purchased
9. Software purchased

Outcomes

1. Change in user job performance
2. Change in productivity level (e.g., decreases in time for search for information)
3. Change in accuracy of information
4. Change in up-to-date dispositions entered into criminal history files
5. Effectiveness of information (e.g., reduced crime, apprehension of suspects, increased convictions)
6. Improved protective order filing systems
7. Change in time for case processing
8. Levels of user satisfaction, usability of screens, organization of information, success rate (e.g., did they find the information?), levels of effort to use system
9. Improvements in accuracy, completeness, and interstate availability of criminal history records
10. Improved local access to state record systems and interstate systems (including NCIC, National Instant Criminal Background Check, the Interstate Identification System (IIS), IAFIS, Sex Offender Registry, National Protection Order File, or other watch lists)

C. Paul Coverdell Forensic Science

(Only goes to entities with an existing crime lab. Currently there are only three subgrantees: ISP, ICJI, and Marion County)

Outputs

1. Change in the number of days between submission of a sample to a forensic science laboratory and delivery of test results to a requesting office or agency
2. Number of backlogged forensic cases analyzed with Coverdell funds, if applicable to the grant
3. Number of forensic science or medical examiner personnel who completed appropriate training or educational opportunities with Coverdell funds, if applicable to the grant.
4. If a training component is part of the program:
 - a. Number and type of education or training programs
 - b. Number of personnel educated/trained
 - c. Number of criminal justice personnel educated/trained
 - d. Number of hours spent on training and education per participant
2. Equipment purchased
3. Cases processed
4. Improved backlogs in lab testing



[The following, are Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) programs]

D. Drug Court Programs

Outputs

1. Number and percentage of drug offenders screened for participation by drug type
2. Number and percentage of those screened that entered program
3. Number and percentage of those in program that were given drug tests
4. Number and percentage of drug screens indicating drug use by type
5. Number of weekly contacts with officers and program participants
6. Average number of contacts with judge per participant
7. Average number of drug treatment sessions per participant
8. Average length of time participating in the drug court
9. Average number of job referrals per client
10. Average number of sanctions and rewards by type per client
11. Number of referrals to or formal written partnerships with participating agencies
12. If a training component is part of the program:
 - a. Number and type of education or training programs
 - b. Number of offenders educated/trained
 - c. Number of criminal justice personnel educated/trained
 - d. Number of hours spent on training and education per participant (offender and agency personnel)

Outcomes

1. Number and percentage that successfully complete program
2. Number of job placements based on referrals
3. Average number of days of paid employment per graduate
4. Characteristics of program graduates and those who do not complete program
5. Number and percentage of participants that fail to appear at hearings and number of bench warrants issued
6. Number and percentage of graduates self-reporting drug use within one year of graduation (state how assessed)
7. Number and percentage of graduates re-arrested (including frequency of arrest) during program or within one year of graduation (including whether arrest is new crime or violation by type of crime).
8. Average time to re-arrest for graduates
9. Number and percentage of graduates obtaining high school diploma or GED during program or within one year of graduation
10. Number and percentage of graduates employed one year after graduation



11. Number and percentage of graduates using public assistance within one year of graduation
12. Number and percentage of participants with improved health, housing, and income
13. If training is part of outputs, number and percent of community members, staff, non-program personnel and offenders with increased knowledge from training and educational programs

E. Multi-jurisdictional Task Force (MJTF)

Outputs

1. Number of new cases filed in current grant period
2. Number of cases dropped
3. Number of cases involving more than one task force
4. Number of active cases carried over from pervious grant period
5. Regarding agencies participating with the MJTF:
 - a. Number of agencies participating (not other task forces, but non-task force entities—DEA, ATF, FBI, other non-signatory agencies, etc.)
 - b. Identify and list the agencies
6. Number of illegal aliens identified
7. Type of training received
8. Number of people trained
9. Number of hours of training provided, number of sessions
10. Number of personnel dedicated to the task force (part- and full-time)
11. Types of operations/activities undertaken
12. Number of search warrants executed
13. Number of undercover surveillance operations
14. Number of confidential informants (new and carried over)
15. Number of citizen affidavits
16. Number of community meetings held
17. Number of community referrals, tips (hotline activity)
18. Number of witnesses in witness protection
19. Media coverage (television, newspaper, radio)
20. Existence of space/location shared by task force members
21. Number of contacts between task force members (formal-standard meetings; informal-average calls, meetings)
22. Number of meth-related investigations conducted
23. Number of meth-related search warrants issued
24. If a training component is part of the program:



- a. number and type of education or training programs
- b. number of personnel educated/trained
- c. number of criminal justice personnel educated/trained
- d. number of hours spent on training and education per participant (offender and agency personnel)

Outcomes

1. Number of arrests for drugs and other offenses
2. Arrests for violation of controlled substances
3. Number of fugitives arrested
4. Seizures of controlled substances
5. Assets seized/value of seized assets
6. Number of charges file per defendant
7. Number of federal charges, state charges
8. Sentence length and type (consecutive, concurrent)
9. Average sentence length per conviction
10. Number of busts, number of buys (undercover and CI)
11. Dismantled marijuana growing operations
12. Number of drug labs; packing, processing, and distribution locations identified; number destroyed
13. Property forfeited, value of property
14. Number of trials, acquittals, pleas
15. Closed drug houses, locations
16. Police calls for service in target area
17. Crime rates in target area
18. Reduction in supply of drugs
19. Percent reduction in purity of drugs
20. Weapons confiscated, firearms seized
21. Number of prosecutions, number of convictions, rate of convictions
22. Number of cooperative cases with non-task force law enforcement and other states
23. Regarding methamphetamine violations
 - a. Number of meth-related sites mitigated or cleaned up
 - b. Amount/street value of meth seized in grams
 - c. Amount of meth precursors seized in grams
 - d. Amount/street value of meth purchased in grams
 - e. Number of meth-related arrests



- f. Number of meth dump sites identified
24. If training is part of outputs, number and percent of community members, staff, non-program personnel and offenders with increased knowledge from training and educational programs

F. Drug prosecution

Outputs

1. Number of staff solely dedicated to gang interdiction activities
2. Number of drug offenders prosecuted, by type of drug
3. Different levels of drug charges (e.g., number of charges in each felony class)
4. Number of drug (or gang) investigations initiated in current grant period
5. Number of filings for forfeitures
6. Number of legal update training sessions provided for law enforcement
7. Number of contacts with school, housing authorities, other partners
8. Number of officers receiving intensive training on drugs (or gangs)
9. Number of intelligence systems developed, subscribed to; numbers of officers who were trained, given access to these systems
10. Type of equipment purchased, number of user trained on equipment
11. Number of investigations coordinated with federal authorities
12. Number of investigation that involve domestic manufacture, dealing and possession versus importation/trafficking

Outcomes

1. Number of arrests resulting from these investigations
2. Number of convictions resulting from these investigations
3. Number of trials, acquittals, and guilty pleas from these investigations
4. Total value received for forfeiture sales





II. Youth Services

A. Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC)

Outputs

1. Number and percent of program staff trained
2. Number of program youth served
3. Number of youth served carried over from previous grant cycles
4. Number of hours of program staff training provided (specify training)
5. Number of non-program personnel trained (specify training)
6. Number of DMC-related program materials developed
7. Number of planning activities conducted
8. Number of program/agency policies created, amended, or rescinded

Outcomes

1. Number and percent of youth completing program requirements (including list of program requirements in effect when youth entered program)
2. Number and percent of youth exhibiting a desired change in targeted behaviors (e.g. delinquency, crime, status offenses, substance use, antisocial behavior, suspendable or expellable behaviors and family relationship indicators)
3. Number and percent of recommendations made from assessment studies implemented
4. Number of minority staff hired
5. Number and percent of program families satisfied with the program (e.g. staff relations and expertise, general program operations, facilities, materials, and service)
6. Number and percent of non-program personnel (DMC volunteer coordinators) with increased knowledge of DMC and DMC-related topics (as a result of trainings or other formal learning opportunities)
7. Number and percent of program staff with increased knowledge of DMC and DMC-related topics (as a result of trainings or other formal learning opportunities)

B. Education in detention

Outputs

1. Number of program youth served
2. Use of best practice model
3. Number of Education in Detention program materials developed
4. Number of hours of program staff training provided
5. Number and percent of program staff trained
6. Number of planning activities conducted



Outcomes

1. Number and percent of youth completing program requirements (including list of program requirements)
2. Number and percent of youth exhibiting a desired change in targeted behaviors (e.g. delinquency, crime, status offenses, substance use, antisocial behavior, suspendable or expellable behaviors, family relationship indicators)
3. Number and percent of program staff with increased knowledge of program area
4. Number and percent of program families satisfied with the program
5. Number and percent of program youth satisfied with program

C. Mental health needs of kids in juvenile justice system

Outputs

1. Number of program youth served
2. Use of best practice model
3. Number of youth screened/assessed at intake procedure
4. Number and percent of program staff trained
5. Number of mental health needs program materials developed
6. Number of hours of program staff training provided
7. Number of planning activities conducted
8. Number of youth referred to mental health services

Outcomes

1. Number and percent of youth completing program requirements (including list of program requirements)
2. Number and percent of youth exhibiting a desired change in targeted behaviors (e.g. delinquency, crime, status offenses, substance use, antisocial behavior, suspendable or expellable behaviors and family relationship indicators)
3. Number and percent of program youth who offend or re-offend (includes re-arrest and/or juvenile court appearance)
4. Number and percent of program youth charged with formal probation violations
5. Number and percent of program youth complying with aftercare plan
6. Number and percent of program staff with increased knowledge of program area
7. Number and percent of program families satisfied with the program
8. Number and percent of program youth satisfied with program
9. Number of relevant program/agency policies created, amended, rescinded



D. Alternatives to detention

Outputs

1. Number of program slots available
2. Number of youth in program
3. Use of best practice model
4. Number and percent of program staff trained
5. Number of alternatives to detention program materials developed
6. Number of hours of program staff training provided
7. Number of planning activities conducted

Outcomes

1. Number and percent of youth completing program requirements (including list of program requirements)
2. Number and percent of program youth who offend or re-offend (includes re-arrest and/or juvenile court appearance; include type of offense)
3. Percent change in the average daily population in secure detention
4. Percent change of average length of stay (in days) in secure detention
5. Percent change in use of detention alternatives: the percent change in the utilization rate of applicable detention alternative programs, such as shelter care
6. Number and percent of program families satisfied with the program
7. Number and percent of program staff with increased knowledge of program area

E. Quality defense

Outputs

1. Use of best practice model
2. Number and percent of program staff trained,
3. Number of program youth served in current grant period
4. Number and proportion (if partial) of public defenders funded
5. Number of quality defense program materials developed
6. Number of hours of program staff training provided
7. Number and percent of program staff trained
8. Number of planning activities conducted



Outcomes

1. Number and percent of program families satisfied with the process/program (satisfaction with staff expertise, general program operations, facilities, materials)
2. Number and percent of program staff with increased knowledge of program area
3. Number and percent of program youth satisfied with program

F. Education advocacy

Outputs

1. Number and percent of program staff and volunteers trained
2. Number of hours spent in advocacy activities (staff and volunteers)
3. Number of program youth served
4. Number of program materials developed
5. Number of hours of program staff training provided
6. Number of planning activities conducted
7. Number of hours of advocate training provided

Outcomes

1. Number and percent of volunteers/advocates remaining involved until case closed
2. Number and percent of advocates satisfied with the process/programs (e.g., staff relations and expertise, general program operations, facilities, materials and services)
3. Number and percent of program families satisfied with the process/programs (e.g., staff relations and expertise, general program operations, facilities, materials and services)
4. Number and percent of program staff with increased knowledge of program area
5. Number and percent of program youth satisfied with process/program
6. Number and percent of juvenile justice staff satisfied with process/program

G. Re-entry (improved transitional and aftercare programs)

Outputs

1. Number of program youth served
2. Number of program slots available
3. Number of Re-entry program materials developed
4. Number and percent of program staff trained
5. Use of best practice model
6. Number of hours of program staff training provided
7. Number of planning activities conducted



Outcomes

1. Number and percent of youth completing program requirements (including a list of program requirements)
2. Number and percent of program youth who reoffend (rearrested or referred to juvenile court)
3. Number and percent of program youth exhibiting a desired change in targeted behaviors (e.g., delinquency, crime, status offenses, substance use, antisocial behavior, suspendable or expellable behaviors and family relationship indicators)
4. Number and percent of program youth charged with formal probation violations
5. Number and percent of program youth committed to correctional facility
6. Number and percent of program staff with increased knowledge of program area
7. Number and percent of program families satisfied with the program
8. Number and percent of program youth satisfied with program

H. Graduated Sanctions

Outputs

1. Number and percent of program youth served
2. Number of program slots available
3. Number of graduated sanctions program materials developed
4. Number and percent of program staff trained
5. Use of best practice model
6. Number and percent of sanction options at each level: immediate, intermediate, secure care, aftercare.

Outcomes

1. Number and percent of program youth who offend or reoffend
2. Number and percent of youth completing program requirements (including a list of program requirements)
3. Number and percent of program youth charged with formal probation violations
4. Number and percent of program youth committed to correctional facility
5. Number and percent of program staff with increased knowledge of program area
6. Number and percent of program families satisfied with the program
7. Number and percent of program youth satisfied with program





III. Victim Services

A. General (all) programs

Outputs

1. Number of victims served (by crime type and services provided)
2. Number of referrals received and made (by agency/source, by location/ZIP code of recipient)
3. Number of victims receiving literature and/or assistance (counseling) involving rights and the criminal justice process
4. Number of follow-up contacts (e.g., letters, phone calls, visits) regarding case status
5. Number of public presentations (e.g., schools, community groups, churches)

Outcomes

1. Trends in victims served (by crime type and services provided)
2. Rate of area victims served—number of victims served compared to area crime rates (by offense category)
3. Victim satisfaction with program and services
4. Increased awareness of victim services and advocacy
5. Rate of victim appearances/cooperation (percent of no-shows, refusals to testify, victim impact statements)

B. Law enforcement/prosecutors (domestic violence and sexual assault) and sexual assault treatment centers

Outputs

1. Number of examinations/reports done by Sexual Assault Nurse Examiners (SANE)
2. Number of clinical (medical/psychological) examinations
3. Number of investigative interviews (i.e., gathering of non-medical case information for arrest or prosecution)
4. Number of protective orders filed
5. Number of safety plans developed
6. Number of referrals made and received between agencies (e.g., police, prosecutor's offices, victim service agencies)
7. Number of partnerships (collaborative relationships)
8. Number of referrals to domestic violence shelters
9. Number of victim case status updates regarding the accused



Outcomes

1. Number of arrests
2. Number of prosecutions
3. Arrest rate, by offense type (e.g., domestic assaults, sexual assault, child abuse)
4. Charging rate (by offense) and number of counts (per offender)
5. Conviction rate by offense (and mode of conviction—plea versus trial), and by offender type (e.g., first versus repeat offender)
6. Number of interactions between victim and criminal justice system (e.g., interviews, court appearances)
7. Number and percent of victims satisfied with program/services
8. Rate of protection order violation
9. Rate of protection order enforcement (arrests and prosecutions)
10. Number (percent) of safety plans reportedly used by victims
11. Number of formal, written inter-agency agreements detailing collaborative partnerships
12. Formal participation in, or sponsorship of, activities by other agencies that serve victims
13. Agency satisfaction surveys
14. Number of placements in domestic violence shelters (specify emergency shelter or transitional housing)
15. Percent of program staff satisfied with collaborative partnerships

C. Domestic violence shelters

Outputs

1. Number of victims receiving shelter services (including referrals)
2. Number of safety plans developed
3. Number of counseling sessions (group and individual sessions) per victim (client)

Outcomes

1. Average number of sessions per victim
2. Percent of services (agency- and referral-specific services) accessed by victims
3. Number and percent of victims satisfied with domestic violence services
4. Number and percent of safety plans reportedly used by victims
5. Number and percent of repeat victimizations

D. Counseling centers

Outputs

1. Number of contacts (calls and walk-ins) for counseling service handled (by type and per client)



2. Number of counseling sessions by type and per victim (client)
3. Number of counseling referrals (by type and per victim client)
4. Number of clinical and non-clinical service provider assessments

Outcomes

1. Average number of sessions per victim
2. Percent of services (agency- and referral-specific services) accessed by victims
3. Number of victims satisfied with services
4. Number of clinical and non-clinical service provider reassessments
5. Number of victims reporting improved well-being

E. Rape crisis centers

Outputs

1. Number of calls for crisis center service handled
2. Number of victims receiving referrals or crisis center services

Outcomes

1. Percent of services (agency-and referral-specific services) accessed by victims
2. Number and percent of victims indicating satisfaction with services

F. Child advocacy

Outputs

1. Number of clinical (medical/psychological) examinations
2. Number of investigative interviews (i.e., gathering of non-medical case information for arrest or prosecution)
3. Number of counseling sessions (child and family) by type and per victim (client)
4. Number of counseling referrals by type and per victim
5. Number of service provider assessments

Outcomes

1. Average number of sessions per victim
2. Number of contacts/interaction with child victims and criminal justice system (e.g., interviews, court appearances)
3. Victim, caregiver/guardian satisfaction with child advocacy services/program
4. Average number of counseling sessions attended



G. Court appointed special advocates (CASAs)

Outputs

1. Number of clients under CASA supervision
2. Number of interactions between CASA advocate and client/family

Outcomes

1. Percent clients who experienced neglect or abuse while under CASA supervision
2. Victim/caregiver satisfaction with program/services
3. Total victim notifications performed
4. Well-being of victim
5. Percentage of cases closed during the year that achieved permanency (i.e., reunification, adoption, or guardianship—not long-term foster care) within 18 months after being assigned to the CASA program



V. Selected Sources

Drug Courts:

Commonly Used Measures of Drug Court Performance. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance, Center for Program Evaluation. Accessed February 12, 2006, at www.ojp.usdoj.gov/BJA/evaluation/psi_courts/drug5.htm

Drug Court Monitoring, Evaluation, and Management Information Systems, U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance. Accessed March 6, 2006 at <http://www.ncjrs.gov/html/bja/monitor/welcome.html>

Defining Drug Courts: The Key Components. (1997/2004). Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance. p. 19. Accessed February 13, 2006, at <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/BJA/grant/05RSATsol.pdf>

RSAT:

Residential Substance Abuse Treatment for State Prisoners Program: FY 2005 Formula Grant Announcement. (1997/2004). U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance. p. 9-11. Accessed February 13, 2006, at <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/BJA/grant/05RSATsol.pdf>

Commonly Used Measures of Residential Substance Abuse Treatment. U.S. National Institute of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance, Center for Program Evaluation. Accessed February 13, 2006, at http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/BJA/evaluation/psi_rsats/rsat5.htm

Victim Services:

Managing for Results: A Logical Approach for Program Design, Outcome Measurement and Process Evaluation. <http://www.performancevistas.org/PVIPlanningTools.html> and the Tennessee Office of Criminal Justice Programs (Victim Services). Accessed February 14, 2006, at <http://www.state.tn.us/finance/rds/victimshomepage.htm>

Evaluation Guidebook For Projects Funded By S.T.O.P. Formula Grants Under The Violence Against Women Act. (1997). The Urban Institute (www.urban.org). Access February 14, 2006, at <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/BJA/evaluation/guide/documents/stop1-4.html>

JAG, MJTF, Coverdell:

Byrne Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Performance Measures. Bureau of Justice Assistance. Retrieved February 20, 2006, from <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/BJA/grant/JAGPerfMeasures.pdf>

Commonly used measures of Task Force Performance. Bureau of Justice Assistance, Center for Program Evaluation. Retrieved February 20, 2006, from http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/BJA/evaluation/psi_mtf/forces5.htm

Paul Coverdell Forensic Science Improvement Grant Program Grant Announcement for Fiscal Year 2005. (2005, April 21). DOJ/OJP/NIJ. Accessed February 14, 2006, at <http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/sl000701.pdf>

Juvenile Services:

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. (2005). *Formula Grants and Title V Programs Regional Performance Measurement Training*. Written materials provided during training, March 15-16.



Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. (2006). *State Level Activity Report, Fiscal Year 2004*, as submitted by ICJI to OJJDP.

CSR Incorporated. (2006). An Introduction to the Revised JABG Performance Indicators. Presented at JABG Specialist Training, January 31-February 2.

Youth Law T.E.A.M. of Indiana. (undated). An Indiana Assessment of Education Services in Juvenile Detention Centers and County Jails.