



JUVENILE JUSTICE SERVICES – OUTPUT AND OUTCOME MEASURES

EXECUTIVE OFFICES & CRIMINAL JUSTICE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE
STAFF: ZACKERY KING

ISSUE BRIEF

SUMMARY

As part of a Human Services In-depth Budget Review (found at <http://le.utah.gov/interim/2010/pdf/00001613.pdf>), the Department of Human Services reported a six year history of output and outcome measures and benchmarking information if it existed. The department has updated this information and included an additional year. A six year history of measures is included in the appendix. The brief highlights changes from information presented a year ago and identifies measures that have improved or declined by more than 5 percent. Fiscal Analyst recommendations are also included.

LEGISLATIVE ACTION

The Fiscal Analyst recommends:

1. The Legislature review the existing DJJS measures for adequacy and relevance of the information being measured prior to these measures being integrated into long term measurement. In the opinion of the Fiscal Analyst, measure #6 (repeated a number of times for different programmatic areas) best fits the recommendation of “measure things that matter.”
2. DJJS compare its performance to the performance of other states.
3. DJJS compare its own performance to that of private providers of similar services under contract with DJJS.
4. The Youth Parole Authority develop outcome measures to annually report to the Legislature.

HUMAN SERVICES IN-DEPTH BUDGET REVIEW RECOMMENDATION REGARDING OUTCOMES

The Human Services In-depth Budget Review (found at <http://le.utah.gov/interim/2010/pdf/00001613.pdf>) was assigned by the Executive Appropriations Committee (EAC) and later heard by EAC and the Social Services and Executive Offices and Criminal Justice appropriations subcommittees. The in-depth review included 15 major recommendations and 14 other additional recommendations. The two subcommittees passed intent language to have Human Services report back on the progress and status of the review’s recommendations during the 2012 General Session. One of the major 15 recommendations was:

All department divisions [should] follow best practices for performance measures:

- *Measure things that matter*
- *Focus on outcomes, then outputs*
- *Compare internally and against other states*

The in-depth budget review identified the best internal department examples for outcome measures. The review stated, “For outcome measures of state provided services, DCFS [Division of Child and Family Services] is the best example. They have meaningful measures, compare different regions, publish them on their public website, and benchmark against other states. . . For outcome measures of contract-provided services, DSAMH [Division of Substance Abuse and Mental Health] is the best example in the department. They have meaningful measures, compare different providers, publish them on their public website, and benchmark against other states.”

HUMAN SERVICES OVERALL GOALS

As part of its FY 2013 budget submission, the Department of Human Services provided the following four department-wide goals:

- *collaborate with community partners and within the Department on issues that cut across divisions*
- *maintain and improve transparency regarding Department finances and operations in the community*
- *foster creativity, innovation and adoption of best models and practices*
- *improve outcomes and results by using measures which lead to good decisions that drive success*

ANALYSIS OF DIVISION OF JUVENILE JUSTICE SERVICES OUTPUT AND OUTCOME MEASURES

DJJS has made significant changes to the measures it presented in the fall of 2010 as part of the in-depth budget review (discontinuing many of its old measures and replacing them with numerous new measures). Analysis at the time of the in-depth budget review regarding the DJJS output and outcome measures stated, "DJJS provided the LFA with 10 measures for the in-depth budget review. . . . Five of the 10 measures had statements indicating they were no longer being used. Two of the remaining five are output measures representing the number of providers reviewed or hearings held. Only three measures deal with outcomes, and they do not fully meet expectations. These three measures include: (1) % of training hours completed; (2) juveniles will demonstrate increase in pro-social behavior and desire to change; (3) youth will not be involved in critical incidents during their stay in detention (i.e. – suicide, escape, assault). DJJS does not include any of its measures in its annual report nor does it publish these measures on its publicly-accessed website. The Analyst believes that this \$87 million budget deserves more robust outcome measures to provide a sense of performance. The division should follow the DCFS example of developing substantive outcome measures, including measures that compare various providers of services, and publish these measures (with explanations) on its publicly accessed website."

A comparison of measures included in the DJJS in-depth review submission to the measures included in the current submission indicates a significant change in the measures being used. Although the DJJS submission includes 48 measures, a number of these are the same measures repeated for different program categories. Of the 48 measures included in the appendix, 13 are new with only one year's data while eight measures are no longer used. The Fiscal Analyst recommends the subcommittee review the existing DJJS measures for adequacy and relevance of the information being measured prior to these measures being integrated into long term measurement. In the opinion of the Fiscal Analyst, measure #6 (repeated a number of times for different programmatic areas) best fits the recommendation of "measure things that matter." DJJS is the only division in the department that does not benchmark any of its measures to other states. The Fiscal Analyst further recommends DJJS compare its performance to the performance of other states. The Fiscal Analyst also recommends DJJS compare its own performance to that of private providers of similar services under contract with DJJS. The Fiscal Analyst further recommends the Youth Parole Authority develop outcome measures to annually report to the Legislature.

DJJS measures showing greater than 5% improvement

No DJJS measures show a greater than 5% improvement between FY 2010 and FY 2011

DJJS measures showing greater than 5% decline:

#3 - Volunteer Services – number of hours of volunteer service (-46%)

#28 - Observation and Assessment – percent of youth where the assessment disposition recommendations are followed by the Court (-7%)

#48 - Youth Parole Authority – client hearings held annually (-5%)

APPENDIX: JUVENILE JUSTICE SERVICES AGENCY OUTPUT AND OUTCOME MEASURES

As part of the Department of Human Services In-depth Budget Review, agencies within Human Services were asked to provide a six year history of accountability measures along with any indications if benchmarking was being used, and if so, who was being used to benchmark against (see the Department of Human Services In-depth Budget Review Appendix 3, pages 65 through 74 found at: <http://le.utah.gov/interim/2010/pdf/00001615.pdf>). The table included in the appendix updates information from the in-depth review, including eliminating some measures and adding others, and adds measures for one additional year.

Division of Juvenile Justice Services - Output and Outcome Measures - FY05 Through FY 11

FY10 Total Expenditures	FY11 Total Expenditures	Appropriation Unit	Unit		Performance Measure	Measure Target	Measure FY 05	Measure FY 06	Measure FY 07	Measure FY 08	Measure FY 09	Measure FY 10	Measure FY 11	Measure can be benchmarked to performance by others?	If yes, who are you using to benchmark against?
\$100,006,164	\$94,107,100	JUVENILE JUSTICE SERVICES:													
\$3,948,058	\$4,391,200	KJA ADMINISTRATION	ADMINISTRATION												
			QUALITY ASSURANCE	1	Quality Reviews Completed: Shows number of providers reviewed to ensure ongoing quality of services provided.	110		111	122	110	110	121	122	No	
			TRAINING	2	Percent of training hours completed: identifies the level of compliance to having adequately trained staff	100%	94.9%	95.9%	93.4%	90.1%	91.1%	95.0%	91.7%	No	
			VOLUNTEER SERVICES	3	Volunteer Hours of Service						65,562	119,000	64,613	No	
\$11,377,591	\$11,325,800	KJC EARLY INTERVENTION	COMMON PROGRAM COSTS	4	Early Intervention: Juveniles completing the program will not re-offend in 6 months following discharge (target reached?)	70%			yes	no	Data no longer used	Data no longer used	Data no longer used	No	
			WORK CAMPS	5	Percent of Youth who complete at least 85% of their Court-ordered restitution and community service while in the program						67.8%	76.9%	76.2%	No	
				6	Percent of Youth Without a New Felony Charge Within 360 Days of Release	82%							81%	No	
				7	Percent of Youth Without a New Felony or Misdemeanor Charge Within 360 Days of Release	50%							48.3%	No	
				8	Percent of Youth Who Do Not Have a Felony Charge While In-Program	100%					100%	99%	99%	No	
				9	Percent of Youth Who Do Not Have a Felony or Misdemeanor Charge While In-Program	98%					98.9%	97.5%	98.6%	No	
			RECEIVING CENTERS	10	Percent of Law Enforcement Officers Returning to the Community Within 20 Minutes of Bringing a Client into the Facility.	90%		yes	yes	no	89.4%	88%	90.0%	No	
				11	Percent of Youth Released to a Parent / Guardian	60%					60.5%	55.7%	56.3%	No	
			YOUTH SERVICES												
			DIVERSION	12	Percent of Youth who complete the Program (Currently SLEIS Only)	90%						90.8%	90.1%	No	
				13	Percent of Youth with a Negative (Clean) Drug Test at Program End (Currently SLEIS Only)	85%						83.7%	85.1%	No	
				14	Percent of Youth Completing the Program Without a Felony or Misdemeanor Charge Within 90 Days.	80%					76.0%	76.0%	77.7%	No	
				15	Percent of Youth Completing the Program Without a Felony Charge Within 90 Days.	97%					97.0%	96.5%	96.9%	No	
				16	Percent of Youth Who Do Not Have a Felony Charge While In-Program	99%					98.9%	99.4%	98.9%	No	
				17	Percent of Youth Who Do Not Have a Felony or Misdemeanor Charge While In-Program	95%					93.8%	94.1%	93.7%	No	
\$32,940,063	\$27,885,700	KJD COMMUNITY PROGRAMS	CASE MANAGEMENT	18	Percent of Youth Leaving the Program Without a New Felony Charge Within 360 Days of Release	80%							81.9%	No	
				19	Percent of Youth Leaving the Program Without a New Felony or Misdemeanor Charge Within 360 Days of Release	50%							51.8%	No	
				20	Percent of Youth Who Do Not Have a Felony Charge While In-Program	97.0%					97.1%	95.3%	95.7%	No	
				21	Percent of Youth Who Do Not Have a Felony or Misdemeanor Charge While In-Program	90%					88.1%	86.2%	86.1%	No	
			COMMUNITY PROGRAMS	22	Community Prog: Juveniles completing the program will not re-offend in 6 months following discharge (target reached?)	70%		not avail.	yes	no	no	No longer used	No longer used	No	
				23	Community Prog: Juveniles will demonstrate increase in pro-social behavior and desire to change (target reached?)	60%		yes	yes	yes	yes	70%	No longer used	No	
				24	Percent of Youth Without a New Felony Charge Within 360 Days of Release	80%							82.2%	No	
				25	Percent of Youth Without a New Felony or Misdemeanor Charge Within 360 Days of Release	45%							41.5%	No	
				26	Percent of Youth Who Do Not Have a Felony Charge While In-Program	99.0%					99.2%	98.7%	98.4%	No	
				27	Percent of Youth Who Do Not Have a Felony or Misdemeanor Charge While In-Program	93%					95.4%	94.6%	92.5%	No	
			OBSERVATION & ASSESSMENT	28	Percent of Youth Where the Assessment Disposition Recommendations are Followed by the Court	86%					88.1%	89.1%	83.3%	No	
				29	Percent of Youth Who Do Not Have a Felony Charge While In-Program	99%					99.8%	98.3%	99.4%	No	
				30	Percent of Youth Who Do Not Have a Felony or Misdemeanor Charge While In-Program	98.0%					99.1%	96.6%	98.0%	No	
			OUT OF STATE PLACEMENT												
			TRANSITION (AFTER CARE)	31	Percent of Youth Without a New Felony Charge Within 360 Days of Release								74.8%	No	
				32	Percent of Youth Without a New Felony or Misdemeanor Charge Within 360 Days of Release								47.7%	No	
				33	Percent of Youth Who Do Not Have a Felony Charge While In-Program	98%					99.1%	97.2%	97.5%	No	
				34	Percent of Youth Who Do Not Have a Felony or Misdemeanor Charge While In-Program	88%					92.7%	85.8%	86.0%	No	

\$27,100,433	\$27,730,300	KJE CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES	DETENTION FACILITIES, OBSERVATION & ASSESSMENT, SECURE FACILITIES	35	Corr. Facilities: Juveniles will demonstrate understanding of issues experienced by their victims (target reached?)	75%		no	yes	no	no	No longer used	No longer used	No	
				36	Corr. Fac: Youth will not be involved in critical incidents during their stay in detention (i.e.. Suicide, escape, assault) (target met?)	90%		yes	yes	yes	yes	96%	No longer used	No	
				37	Corr. Facilities: At discharge from the program, juveniles will demonstrate an increase in social functioning (target reached?)	75%		yes	yes	no	Data no longer used	No longer used	No longer used	No	
			DETENTION	38	Admissions Percent for Clients Awaiting Placement								11.7%	No	
				39	Admissions Percent for Clients with New Charges								21.7%	No	
				40	Admissions Percent for Clients with Contempt, Warrants, or Administrative Holds								62.8%	No	
			SECURE	41	Percent of Youth Without a New Felony Charge Within 360 Days of Release								69.9%	No	
				42	Percent of Youth Without a New Felony or Misdemeanor Charge Within 360 Days of Release								41.7%	No	
				43	Percent of Youth Who Do Not Have a Felony Charge While In-Program	98%					97.6%	96.2%	96.7%	No	
				44	Percent of Youth Who Do Not Have a Felony or Misdemeanor Charge While In-Program	95%					94.5%	93.6%	93.9%	No	
			OBSERVATION & ASSESSMENT		See Observation and Assessment Measures under KJD Community Programs										
\$24,296,999	\$22,425,300	KJJ RURAL PROGRAM	DIVERSION		See Diversion Measures under KJC Early Intervention Services										
			CASE MANAGEMENT	45	Juveniles will demonstrate personal accountability by the end of programming (target reached?)	80%		no	yes	no	Data no longer used	No longer used	No longer used	No	
					See Case Management Measures under KJD Community Programs										
			COMMUNITY PROGRAMS		See Community Program Measures under KJD Community Programs										
			DETENTION, SECURE, & SHELTER	46	Rural Prog: Youth will not be involved in critical incidents during their stay in detention (i.e.. Suicide, escape, assault) (target met?)	90%		no	yes	yes	yes	99%	No longer used	No	
			DETENTION		See Detention Measures under KJE Correctional Facilities										
			SECURE		See Secure Measures under KJE Correctional Facilities										
			STATE SUPERVISION		Discontinued Program. Cut in 2008 and 2009.										
			OBSERVATION & ASSESSMENT		See Observation & Assessment Measures under KJD Community Programs										
			RECEIVING CENTERS	47	See Receiving Center Measures under KJC Early Intervention Services	90%		yes		no	no	89%	90%	No	
			SHELTER												
			OUT OF STATE PLACEMENT												
\$343,020	\$348,800	KIT YOUTH PAROLE AUTHORITY	YOUTH PAROLE AUTHORITY	48	Client hearings held annually			787	685	807	768	702	665	No	