



**King County**



**City of Seattle**

**Program Assessment and Improvement Plan**  
Using the  
**Guidebook to Elements of Successful Programs**

---

**Version 2.1**  
**December 2005**



**King County**  
Community Services Division  
Department of Community and Human  
Services



**City of Seattle**  
Human Services  
Department

# **Program Assessment and Improvement Plan Using the Guidebook to Elements of Successful Programs**

---

Developed for  
**The Community Services Division,  
King County Department of Community and Human Services,  
City of Seattle Human Services Department,  
And  
The King County Juvenile Justice Evaluation Work Group**

Developed by



***Organizational Research Services***

and



***Nancy Ashley, Heliotrope***

**Version 2.1  
December 2005**

This assessment guide has been developed as an implementation tool to be used in conjunction with the *Guidebook to Elements of Successful Programs to Reduce Juvenile Justice Recidivism, Delinquency, and Violence* developed by the same authors. For more information on this Assessment Guide, please contact Organizational Research Services at 1932 First Avenue, Suite 400, Seattle, WA 98101 USA (Phone: 206-728-0474; Email: [ors@organizationalresearch.com](mailto:ors@organizationalresearch.com); Website: [www.organizationalresearch.com](http://www.organizationalresearch.com)). For information on the Guidebook mentioned above, you may also contact Nancy Ashley at Heliotrope, 1249 NE 92nd Street, Seattle, WA 98115 (Phone: 206-526-5671; Email: [nancyashley@heliotropeseattle.com](mailto:nancyashley@heliotropeseattle.com))

Copyright © 2005 King County Department of Community and Human Services, Community Services Division

All rights reserved. Download, reproduction and use of these materials are permitted solely for program development and improvement purposes by public or nonprofit agencies. If any part of these materials is used, please complete and submit the informational form included herein.

**Upon request, this document is available in alternative formats for individuals with special needs.**

**Please call 206-205-3048; TTY: 711 (Relay service)**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>General Purpose and Use</b> .....	1
<b>Steps in the Assessment Process</b> .....	2
<b>Assessment Process Decisions and Actions Checklist</b> .....	4
<b>Program Assessment and Improvement Plan Description</b> .....	6
<b>Selection of Elements to Review</b> .....	7
<b>Review Process for Elements and Indicators</b> .....	8
<b>Ratings of Indicators, Documentation and Information for Action Plans</b> .....	10
<b>Dimension 1. Assess Target Population; Select Highest-Risk Youth</b>	
Element 1. Client Assessment and Selection of Highest-Risk Youth .....	11
<b>Dimension 2. Address Criminogenic Risk Factors Open to Change</b>	
Element 2. Target Changeable Risk Factors That Reduce Criminal Activity... 13	
<b>Dimension 3. Theoretical Basis for Intervention</b>	
Element 3. Program Design Based on Theory and Research.....	14
Element 4. Adaptation of Program Design .....	16
<b>Dimension 4. Design Effective Treatment or Intervention</b>	
Element 5. Matching Services to Characteristics of Program Participants .....	18
a. Cultural Competence .....	19
b. Serving Youth with Mental Disorders .....	21
c. Serving Youth With Substance Use Problems and Co- occurring Mental Disorders.....	23
Element 6. Staff Practice, Qualifications and Support.....	25
Element 7. Engagement, Motivation and Retention of Participants.....	27
Element 8. Behavioral and Cognitive-Behavioral Interventions.....	29
Element 9. Interpersonal Skill Building and Other Skill-oriented Interventions.....	31
a. Employment and Vocational Interventions .....	33
b. Academic Skills and Training .....	35
Element 10. Individual Therapy.....	37
Element 11. Family Therapy/Interventions .....	39

# TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONT'D)

Element 12. Group Therapy .....	41
Element 13. Multiple Services, Casework/Advocacy.....	43
Element 14. Wraparound Process.....	45
Element 15. Avoiding Programs with Mixed or Weak Effects .....	47
Element 16. Avoiding Programs that Don't Work .....	48
<b>Dimension 5. Implement with Quality and Fidelity</b>	
Element 17. Implementation of Practice as Designed .....	50
Element 18. Sufficient Intensity and Duration.....	52
Element 19. Evaluation and Continuous Improvement .....	53
<b>Supports and Resources Surrounding Intervention</b>	
Element 20. Agency Mission .....	55
Element 21. Agency Leadership .....	57
Element 22. Agency Funding and Financial Management .....	59
Element 23. Community Support .....	61
Element 24. Connections across Programs and Services .....	63
<b>Evaluation Form .....</b>	<b>65</b>

## General Purpose and Use

An *Assessment and Improvement Plan* guide has been developed as an implementation tool for the *Guidebook to Elements of Successful Programs*. Together, the *Guidebook* and the *Assessment and Improvement Plan* form a process evaluation tool that identifies key elements of successful programs in the treatment of youth at risk of delinquent behavior and/or recidivism in the juvenile justice system and then helps organizations see the extent to which their programs exhibit these elements.

The *Guidebook* provides an explanation of the important components and approach needed to effectively implement each element. The *Guidebook* also includes indicators that can demonstrate the effective implementation of each element, and information on the methods and sources used to identify the elements and indicators.

The *Guidebook* should be used with the assessment tool. The *Assessment and Improvement Plan* provides a stepwise method for looking at a program or collection of programs to determine needs for improvement in the elements described in the *Guidebook*, or in documentation of their effective application.

The companion assessment tool has been developed to allow organizations to self-assess or funders to determine:

1. How well their programs are effectively implementing the *Guidebook* elements applicable to their programs;
2. Which dimensions and elements of their programs meet the level of effective implementation identified in the *Guidebook* and which may be deficient;
3. How they might improve any deficient aspects of their programs;
4. How well they can document that key criteria or processes that are likely to lead to success are in place; and
5. How they can improve documentation that may be lacking or insufficient.

The format of the *Assessment and Improvement Plan* is in the form of worksheets for each element in the *Guidebook*. Each section lists the indicators to be assessed for each element. After determining which elements apply to the organization's work (internal and/or external), reviewers look at each indicator to determine: 1) the extent to which their program meets the criterion listed and 2) how they can document it.

The users of the *Guidebook* might vary by program. They could include the organization's executive director and/or any staff or stakeholders who are familiar with the program being implemented. It may be advantageous to have different people complete different sections and then bring them back for a team or assessment process manager to review. It is best to implement the process for each program separately.

For additional copies of the Program Assessment and Implementation Plan and the *Guidebook* please download them from the King County website:

<http://www.metrokc.gov/dchs/csd/Youth&Family/index.htm>

# Steps in the Assessment Process

There are several stages of work involved in the assessment process and several ways to complete it. The general steps are presented below and are followed by a checklist to guide the process.

1. Decide who should be involved in the assessment and improvement implementation process and what roles each person should play. This may involve a close review of the *Guidebook*. Significant familiarity with the organization and/or its programs is essential. Each program should be assessed separately but more than one could be completed simultaneously using multiple copies of the *Assessment Plan*. Decisions to be made include:

- a) having one person (e.g., the executive director or program manager) or a team conduct the review or dividing the tasks among different staff members;

- b) doing the review all at once over a few days or selecting one or more elements to review collectively at periodic staff meetings;

- c) deciding which program to assess or whether to conduct multiple assessments simultaneously or consecutively (a separate assessment for each program is recommended); and

- d) the timing for the review with regard to workloads and other evaluation, program design, or fund raising efforts.

If multiple programs are to be reviewed, copy or download separate copies of the *Guidebook* and *Assessment and Improvement Plan* for each program and each staff member participating.

2. Review the list of elements in the front of the *Assessment Plan* and decide which apply to the organization. Most will apply and these have been identified. Others depend on the types of program being implemented.
3. **Read the appropriate section in the *Guidebook* for each element being assessed.**
4. Review each indicator for the **element** and provide an overall rating of the element based on your information about the indicators. Put the ratings on the form for each element. *You do not have to rate each indicator separately.*
5. Describe the documentation for each element rating or comment on how you know it is accurate.
6. Add notes about where documentation can be found on or behind each element rating sheet.
7. If program improvement plans or documentation improvement plans are warranted, add descriptions of the tasks to be undertaken.
8. Develop and implement changes in programs or documentation identified as needed in the assessment.

9. As the improvements are implemented or after needed changes in several areas have been implemented, review and update the assessment. Add the documentation, make notes on the form, enter the date that the reassessment was made, adjust the rating for the element if warranted, and note whether documentation is now available. New documentation or notes about where to find it can be added behind the sheet. In this way, the *Assessment and Improvement Plan* will become a useful tool to remind staff about what types of changes they want to make in their program and a way to document that their program has the elements of successful programs.

The initial assessment and documentation should be achievable within a few days time. The follow-up activities make take several weeks or months to complete. At some time in the future (perhaps every two years), this assessment may be used again to gain fresh insights. If that is done, we suggest that the new version be printed on a different color of paper and/or filed in a separate binder so that it remains distinct from other assessments and the assessment sheets will be more easily distinguished from the documentation inserted.

It is not anticipated that any program would meet each and every indicator of each element in an initial assessment. Process evaluations like these are tools for ongoing assessment and improvement. The review of the assessment may spark discussion of the organization's theory of change, assumptions, clients, staff training, processes, procedures, progress assessment tools, and other aspects. These can be helpful reflective processes that can help organizations celebrate what they do well and identify areas that may need improvement.

If you need assistance interpreting or implementing this assessment, please ask for assistance through your contracting agency.



## Assessment Process Decisions and Actions Checklist

#	Task	Target Date	Date Completed
1	Decide who should conduct the assessment. <i>Who:</i>		
2	Decide which program is the focus of the assessment. <i>Which program:</i>		
3	Decide the timing and estimated timeframe for the assessment. <i>When:</i>		
4	Prepare and distribute copies of the <i>Program Assessment and Improvement Plan</i> and the <i>Guidebook</i> to each participating staff member.		
5	Review the list of elements and decide which apply to the organization or program. <i>Which do not apply?:</i>		
6	<b>Read through the entire <i>Guidebook</i>.</b>		
7	For each element being assessed, 1) refer to the corresponding section in the <i>Guidebook</i> and then review each indicator for that element, and 2) if it applies, provide an overall rating on a 1-5 scale for the particular element based on an assessment of the indicators.		
8	Next, please note the indicators of that element that you either don't currently do and/or would like to see greater improvement on. When that is complete, please identify supporting reasons for the rankings and indicators chosen, identify key pieces of documentation to support the ratings, and provide comments that might be helpful in the development of action plans.		
9	If you have documentation, copy it and place it behind the indicator sheet or add a sheet saying where it can be found. If including an example from a client's records, black out any identifying data that might reveal a client's name.		

## Assessment Process Decisions and Actions Checklist (Cont'd)

10	After all elements have been assessed in this way, compile 1) a list of more thorough program assessments or changes you plan to make to improve your program and 2) a list of the additional ways you need to document your work to show how you meet the standards. This is your Program Improvement Plan.		
11	Decide who will be responsible for making the program changes or developing the documentation needed.		
12	Develop a timeline for making the program changes or developing the documentation needed.		
13	As the changes or documentation are created, come back to this binder and note 1) the date the improvement step was completed, 2) the new rating; and 3) whether documentation is now available.		
14	Add to the binder, documentation of the program changes made or the documentation of the rationale for the original rating.		
15	Communicate and celebrate completion of the assessment process and the improvements made to programs or documentation.		
16	Complete and return the evaluation form at the end of this publication after you have compiled the results of your initial assessment. Also send in copies of your Program Assessment and Improvement Plan Description and Selection of Elements to Review.		

# Program Assessment and Improvement Plan Description

---

Name of Agency: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Executive Director: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of program serving identified youth:

Name, title, telephone and e-mail of manager of program assessed:

Is this a new or existing program? If it is an existing program, how long has it been in operation?

Provide or attach a brief description of the program.

From what group will proposed program participants be selected? Describe the general characteristics of the group.

How many people will be served by this program annually? \_\_\_\_\_

Person responsible for this assessment:	
Date of completion of the initial assessment:	
Target date for follow-up and re-assessment:	
Date of completion of follow-up:	
Other review dates:	

# Selection of Elements to Review

**Step 1: Deciding What Applies** Which of the elements apply to your program? Elements deemed essential are marked with an “x.” Check all other elements that apply to your program. (Ignore shaded boxes.)

## Dimension 1. Assess target Population; Select Highest-Risk Youth

1. Client Assessment and Selection of Highest-Risk Youth	x
--	---

## Dimension 2. Address Criminogenic Risk Factors Open to Change

2. Targeting Changeable Risk Factors That Reduce Criminal Activity	x
--	---

## Dimension 3: Theoretical Basis for Intervention

3. Program Design Based on Theory and Research	x
4. Adaptation of Program Design	

## Dimension 4. Design Effective Treatment or Interventions

5. Matching Services to Characteristics of Program Participants (specific responsivity)	x
5a. Cultural Competence	x
5b. Serving Youth with Mental Disorders	
5c. Serving Youth with Substance Use Problems and Co-occurring Mental Disorders	
6. Staff Practice, Qualifications, and Support	x
7. Engagement, Motivation and Retention of Participants	x
8. Behavioral and Cognitive-Behavioral Interventions	
9. Interpersonal Skill Building and Other Skill-oriented Interventions	
9a. Employment and Vocational Interventions	
9b. Academic Skills and Training	
10. Individual Therapy	
11. Family Therapy/Interventions	
12. Group Therapy	
13. Multiple Services, Casework/Advocacy	
14. Wraparound Process	
15. Avoiding Programs with Mixed or Weak Effects	x
16. Avoiding Programs that Don't Work	x

## Dimension 5. Implement with Quality and Fidelity

17. Implementation of Practice as Designed	x
18. Sufficient Intensity and Duration	x
19. Evaluation and Continuous Improvement	x

## Supports and resources surrounding intervention

20. Agency Mission	x
21. Agency Leadership	x
22. Agency Funding and Financial Management	x
23. Community Support	x
24. Connections across Programs and Services	x

## Review Process for Elements and Indicators

**Step 2: Reviewing Elements and Indicators** The intent at this point is to review each of the Elements of Successful Programs and provide an overall assessment of each element based on an assessment of the different indicators of that element. The specific steps are noted below

**2a)** Read the chapter in the Guidebook describing the element and indicators.

**2b)** Provide an overall rating for the specific element on a 1-5 scale after reviewing the indicators of that element. The rating scale is as follows:

1 – We **don't do any** indicators and/or have room for improvement on **most or all** of the indicators

2 – We do a **few** indicators, but could use improvement on **many** indicators

3 – We do **some** of the indicators, but could use improvement on **some** indicators

4 – We do **most** of the indicators and/or could use improvement on **only a few** indicators

5 – We do **all** the indicators and/or need **no improvement** on the indicators

NA – This element is not applicable to the program

*Only proceed with Steps 2c-2f if you provide an applicable ranking between 1-5 for the particular element being assessed.*

**2c)** Place a check mark next to the indicators of that element that aren't currently happening or need improvement on

**2d)** Discuss any “supporting reasons” for the overall ranking for that element and for the indicators noted as not done or needing improvement. This information provides context and meaning for the overall assessment rankings. For example, if you provide a ranking of a 2 for Element 1: Client Assessment and Selection of Highest-Risk Youth, then a supporting reason for a low ranking might be that “we currently do not have a screening or assessment tool”

**2e)** Identify the key pieces of documentation that might support or provide evidence for the overall element rankings and chosen indicators. This documentation is likely to include reports, assessment tools, evaluation tools, program materials, and other written documents. It would be useful to comment on where the documentation is maintained by the program and examples of key documentation should be kept with the overall assessment tool. For example, if you provide a ranking of a 4 for Element 19: Evaluation and Continuous Improvement, the some of the documentation you might reference would include program logic models, survey instruments and examples of summary reports of data.

**2f)** Provide any comments about the element and indicators that might be useful in the development of Action Plans. A follow-up step to the assessments is the development of Action Plans to help the agency make progress on the areas of need or improvement identified in this assessment. For example, if you provide a ranking of a 2 for Element 1: Client Assessment and Selection of Highest-Risk Youth, and note that you have no screening or assessment tools, a comment to inform the Action Plan might be that the

program needs examples of commonly used tools as a starting point for the development of its own instruments.

It may be helpful to have different members of your program or of the organization assess different elements. If you want a different point of view, you might consider having a board member or knowledgeable volunteer complete it through discussions with appropriate staff members.

When you have completed this initial assessment you will have a clearer picture of where your agency stands in its ability to meet the indicators for the elements that are applicable and what you have documented or need to document in order to “do it well.”

**Step 3: Tracking Assessments and Improvements** We suggest that this assessment be dated and that **documentation for the indicators be kept in a file or binder** for review by staff, managers, board members, or funders. This will greatly aid in documenting the process, and will also assist with ongoing, continuous improvement. For example, if your program has a statement or design description that clearly identifies its theoretical basis and a logic model to describe its resources, activities, outputs, outcomes and goals, these can be included in the file or notebook as documentation. If these need to be created, they can be added later and the indicators can be marked as completed. In this way, the assessment checklist becomes a working document to guide program improvements, as well as document associated efforts.

**Step 4: Follow-Up** We also suggest that there be a **follow-up to the initial assessment at a pre-determined date** in order to determine improvements in documentation or in the program. Places to record dates for these efforts are provided on the coversheet. It is also a good idea to review this list at least annually or whenever significant program changes occur. For example, if the program decided to begin serving youth with mental disabilities, review of that element and indicators would be helpful.

**Ratings of Indicators,  
Documentation  
and  
Information for Action Plans**

**Dimension 1: Assess Target Population; Select Highest Risk Youth**

*Element 1: Client Assessment and Selection of Highest-Risk Youth (see p. 12 in Guidebook)*

<b>Overall Element Rating</b>	1	2	3	4	5	NA
<i>An overall assessment of element looking across the 6 indicators noted below</i>	We <b>don't do any</b> indicators and/or have room for improvement on <b>most or all</b> indicators	We do a <b>few</b> indicators, but could use improvement on <b>many</b> indicators	We do <b>some</b> of the indicators, but could use improvement on <b>some</b> indicators	We do <b>most</b> of the indicators and/or could use improvement on <b>only a few</b> indicators	We do <b>all</b> the indicators and/or need <b>no improvement</b> on the indicators	

Please note those indicators that aren't currently happening and/or need improvement on (*check all that apply*)

- Screening tool is used to select clients in need of a full assessment
- Provider has standard assessment tools that are used for potential/actual clients and which identify youth at moderate to high risk of recidivism
- Instruments are based on research findings about factors for recidivism, and have been validated for the local population
- Provider selects youth at moderate or high risk of recidivism for intervention
- Staff are trained in the use of risk and needs assessment instruments
- Client results on needs assessment are used to create and individualized profile to guide treatment and referrals

1. Please discuss any supporting reasons for the **overall assessment ranking** you have provided and for the indicators you have identified that need improvement over time.

2. Please identify the key pieces of documentation that might support your ratings of the indicators and this element. These might include examples of assessment tools, client plans, risk assessments, etc.

3. Please provide any comments about this element and its indicators that might be helpful in the development of the Action Plans.



**Dimension 2: Address Criminogenic Risk Factors Open to Change**

*Element 2: Target Changeable Risk Factors That Reduce Criminal Activity (see p. 15 in Guidebook)*

<b>Overall Element Rating</b>	1	2	3	4	5	NA
<i>An overall assessment of element looking across the 3 indicators noted below</i>	We <b>don't do any</b> indicators and/or have room for improvement on <b>most or all</b> indicators	We do a <b>few</b> indicators, but could use improvement on <b>many</b> indicators	We do <b>some</b> of the indicators, but could use improvement on <b>some</b> indicators	We do <b>most</b> of the indicators and/or could use improvement on <b>only a few</b> indicators	We do <b>all</b> the indicators and/or need <b>no improvement</b> on the indicators	

Please note those indicators that aren't currently happening and/or need improvement on (*check all that apply*)

- The program has a statement describing its approach and protocol that identifies the changeable risk factors that it addresses in its activities and explains why and how they address them.
- The program articulates the links between targeted risk factors and its activities and explains how its activities will lead to decreases in risk factors.
- The program conducts an assessment of each participant that identifies his/her particularly significant risk factors and other needs and determines how to tailor the program to meet her/his needs.

1. Please discuss any supporting reasons for the **overall assessment ranking** you have provided and for the indicators you have identified that need improvement over time.

2. Please identify the key pieces of documentation that might support your ratings of the indicators and this element. These might include examples of program descriptions, lists of targeted risk factors, etc.

3. Please provide any comments about this element and its indicators that might be helpful in the development of the Action Plans.

**Dimension 3: Theoretical Basis for Intervention**

*Element 3: Program Design Based on Theory and Research (see p. 18 in Guidebook)*

<b>Overall Element Rating</b>	1	2	3	4	5	NA
<i>An overall assessment of element looking across the 8 indicators noted below</i>	We <b>don't do any</b> indicators and/or have room for improvement on <b>most or all</b> indicators	We do a <b>few</b> indicators, but could use improvement on <b>many</b> indicators	We do <b>some</b> of the indicators, but could use improvement on <b>some</b> indicators	We do <b>most</b> of the indicators and/or could use improvement on <b>only a few</b> indicators	We do <b>all</b> the indicators and/or need <b>no improvement</b> on the indicators	

Please note those indicators that aren't currently happening and/or need improvement on (*check all that apply*)

- The provider has a clear written statement of the reasons why it has selected or created the proposed program and this statement identifies, explains, and references the theory and substantiating research that leads the provider to believe that the program will be effective.
- The program has a logic model (as specified in Element 19, p. 77 of the guidebook) that clearly illustrates the links among resources, activities, outputs, outcomes, and goals.
- The written program description describes the program's general approach and specific activities in terms of the five dimensions of successful programs featured in this guide:
  - o Assessing and selecting clients;
  - o Addressing criminogenic risk factors that are open to change;
  - o Having a theoretical basis for the intervention(s);
  - o Using interventions that have been shown to be effective; and
  - o Implementing the program with quality and fidelity.
- The theory and research identify apparent and logical relationships between proposed activities and anticipated outcomes. A clear summary of these links is provided in the program description.
- Staff members are able to articulate the theoretical rationale for their activities.
- Theory and research support that short-term program outcomes are likely to lead to the intermediate and long-term outcomes that reduce recidivism at some stage (though not necessarily observable within the time frame of the program).
- The program activities include the use of appropriate evaluation techniques based on the theoretical links between activities and outcomes (e.g., a program that seeks to change behavior uses an evaluation tool that measures behavior change and not just change in attitude). (See Element 19 p. 77 of the guidebook for more detailed information on evaluation.)
- If proposing a theory for which there is little or no research support, the program manager can explain why his/her experience or other types of wisdom or knowledge support his/her theory.

1. Please discuss any supporting reasons for the **overall assessment ranking** you have provided and for the indicators you have identified that need improvement over time.

2. Please identify the key pieces of documentation that might support your ratings of the indicators and this element. These might include examples of program logic models, statements describing the theories or referencing research that justify the commonly selected interventions, etc.

3. Please provide any comments about this element and its indicators that might be helpful in the development of the Action Plans.

**Dimension 3: Theoretical Basis for Intervention**

*Element 4: Adaptation of Program Design (see p. 21 in Guidebook)*

<b>Overall Element Rating</b>	1	2	3	4	5	NA
<i>An overall assessment of element looking across the 6 indicators noted below</i>	We <b>don't do any</b> indicators and/or have room for improvement on <b>most or all</b> indicators	We do a <b>few</b> indicators, but could use improvement on <b>many</b> indicators	We do <b>some</b> of the indicators, but could use improvement on <b>some</b> indicators	We do <b>most</b> of the indicators and/or could use improvement on <b>only a few</b> indicators	We do <b>all</b> the indicators and/or need <b>no improvement</b> on the indicators	

Please note those indicators that aren't currently happening and/or need improvement on (*check all that apply*)

- Policies and procedures describe essential program elements that have been modified and the theory or reasoning upon which changes are based.
- Stakeholders are included in developing adaptations and approve them.
- Adaptations are based on recorded needs assessments.
- Staff can explain why adaptations were required and what affects they seem to be having.
- Evaluation tools and methods are developed so as to assess program with adaptations.
- Program is reflective of ethnic diversity and cultural pride; locally inappropriate practices are omitted.

1. Please discuss any supporting reasons for the **overall assessment ranking** you have provided and for the indicators you have identified that need improvement over time.

2. Please identify the key pieces of documentation that might support your ratings of the indicators and this element. These might include examples of policies or procedures that describe the modifications made, evaluation tools that illustrate how modifications are reflected in the measurement of results, etc.

3. Please provide any comments about this element and its indicators that might be helpful in the development of the Action Plans.

**Dimension 4: Theoretical Basis for Intervention**

*Element 5: Match Services to Characteristics of Program Participants (see p. 24 in Guidebook)*

<b>Overall Element Rating</b>	1	2	3	4	5	NA
<i>An overall assessment of element looking across the 2 indicators noted below</i>	We <b>don't do any</b> indicators and/or have room for improvement on <b>most or all</b> indicators	We do a <b>few</b> indicators, but could use improvement on <b>many</b> indicators	We do <b>some</b> of the indicators, but could use improvement on <b>some</b> indicators	We do <b>most</b> of the indicators and/or could use improvement on <b>only a few</b> indicators	We do <b>all</b> the indicators and/or need <b>no improvement</b> on the indicators	

Please note those indicators that aren't currently happening and/or need improvement on (*check all that apply*)

- Clients are assessed for responsivity factors during intake and throughout interventions, and results are used to match the offender with the treatment approach and therapist.
- Staff can describe the specific responsivity principle and can identify characteristics that can influence offender's responsiveness to various therapists and treatment modalities.

1. Please discuss any supporting reasons for the **overall assessment ranking** you have provided and for the indicators you have identified that need improvement over time.

2. Please identify the key pieces of documentation that might support your ratings of the indicators and this element. These might include examples of (anonymous) client assessments tools, client service plans, etc.

3. Please provide any comments about this element and its indicators that might be helpful in the development of the Action Plans.

**Dimension 4: Theoretical Basis for Intervention**

*Element 5a: Cultural Competence (see p. 26 in Guidebook)*

<b>Overall Element Rating</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>NA</b>
<i>An overall assessment of element looking across the 17 indicators noted below</i>	We <b>don't do any</b> indicators and/or have room for improvement on <b>most or all</b> indicators	We do a <b>few</b> indicators, but could use improvement on <b>many</b> indicators	We do <b>some</b> of the indicators, but could use improvement on <b>some</b> indicators	We do <b>most</b> of the indicators and/or could use improvement on <b>only a few</b> indicators	We do <b>all</b> the indicators and/or need <b>no improvement</b> on the indicators	

Please note those indicators that aren't currently happening and/or need improvement on (**check all that apply**)

- The provider's mission statement, strategic plan, policies and procedure address how the organization will be culturally competent in its overall operations.
- Board and staff members reflect the culturally diverse groups served by the provider.
- The provider is serving, in a culturally competent manner, the population it intends to serve (whether limited or broad in definition) and (if practical) is capable of serving youth and families from different cultural groups in its community.
- The provider actively recruits participants within the cultural communities it is serving.
- The provider has adequate depth of knowledge about the primary culture(s) of its client population(s).
- Staff and administrators can describe the strengths, social problems, customs, values, languages, and natural helper resources for the primary cultural group(s) with whom they work.
- The provider has developed culturally appropriate service delivery protocols (including outreach activities, interviewing techniques, assessments, resources, and program content) for the group(s) it serves. When appropriate, these may include practices not familiar to Western practitioners.
- The provider has the general ability to bridge the differences between different cultures and the dominant culture and to help participants understand people of different cultures.
- The provider helps clients understand and co-exist peacefully with people of different cultures.
- The provider appreciates the roles that power and privilege play between cultures.
- The staff knows where to get help for clients from cultures with which they are less familiar.
- The staff members are interested in working with people from cultures different from their own.
- Staff can identify and address barriers, hindrances, and aids to providing services to a diverse population.
- Staff has social or professional contacts with the cultural groups in their service area, and uses those contacts to seek input and form collaborations to provide effective services.
- Staff uses culturally appropriate practices and services to successfully work with culturally diverse populations.
- The provider regularly offers training to help new and experienced staff to work more effectively with diverse groups.
- The provider conducts organizational self-assessments regularly, and uses the findings to move toward greater cultural competence.

1. Please discuss any supporting reasons for the **overall assessment ranking** you have provided and for the indicators you have identified that need improvement over time.

2. Please identify the key pieces of documentation that might support your ratings of the indicators and this element. These might include examples of training materials on cultural competency, percentage comparisons of staff, Board, and community diversity, literature in different languages, lists of diverse service organizations on referral lists, etc.

3. Please provide any comments about this element and its indicators that might be helpful in the development of the Action Plans.

**Dimension 4: Theoretical Basis for Intervention**

*Element 5b: Serving Youth with Mental Disorders (see p. 30 in Guidebook)*

<b>Overall Element Rating</b>	1	2	3	4	5	NA
<i>An overall assessment of element looking across the 11 indicators noted below</i>	We <b>don't do any</b> indicators and/or have room for improvement on <b>most or all</b> indicators	We do a <b>few</b> indicators, but could use improvement on <b>many</b> indicators	We do <b>some</b> of the indicators, but could use improvement on <b>some</b> indicators	We do <b>most</b> of the indicators and/or could use improvement on <b>only a few</b> indicators	We do <b>all</b> the indicators and/or need <b>no improvement</b> on the indicators	

Please note those indicators that aren't currently happening and/or need improvement on (*check all that apply*)

- Staff select, and deliver with integrity, appropriate evidence-based therapies and interventions that (a) create an environment conducive to learning and (b) fit the diagnosis of each youth based on thorough assessments of individual needs, especially those with a combination of disabilities.
- Staff develop and monitor strategies for achieving programmatic goals for each youth, making adjustments as needed.
- Staff actively utilize and teach a combination of skill based interventions
- Staff uses incentives and structure to teach prosocial behavior.
- Program includes components related to family involvement and transitional preparation for youth.
- Program is regularly assessed as to effectiveness based on collected data.
- Medication is available and used when efficacious for a youth's diagnosis.
- Care providers have and effectively apply training in how to work with youth with disabilities.
- Care providers relate with youth in sensitive and constructive ways.
- Staff match or can adapt to match the characteristics of youth with whom they work, including those from ethnic and disability cultures.
- Gender-sensitive assessment, operating procedures and services address the unique needs of female and male participants.

1. Please discuss any supporting reasons for the **overall assessment ranking** you have provided and for the indicators you have identified that need improvement over time.

2. Please identify the key pieces of documentation that might support your ratings of the indicators and this element. These might include examples of (anonymous) treatment plans that match diagnoses, guidelines from staff who work/meet youth, staff resumes showing competencies in treating people with mental disorders, etc.

3. Please provide any comments about this element and its indicators that might be helpful in the development of the Action Plans.



**Dimension 4: Theoretical Basis for Intervention**

*Element 5c: Serving Youth with Substance Use Problems and Co-Occurring Mental Disorders (see p. 35 in Guidebook)*

<b>Overall Element Rating</b>	1	2	3	4	5	NA
<i>An overall assessment of element looking across the 8 indicators noted below</i>	We <b>don't do any</b> indicators and/or have room for improvement on <b>most or all</b> indicators	We do a <b>few</b> indicators, but could use improvement on <b>many</b> indicators	We do <b>some</b> of the indicators, but could use improvement on <b>some</b> indicators	We do <b>most</b> of the indicators and/or could use improvement on <b>only a few</b> indicators	We do <b>all</b> the indicators and/or need <b>no improvement</b> on the indicators	

Please note those indicators that aren't currently happening and/or need improvement on (**check all that apply**)

- Staff use effective assessment tools to determine the presence of substance use problems and/or co-occurring disorders, as well as levels of functioning and other factors that affect treatment referrals.
- Programs are designed for adolescents and include an individualized continuum of care plan for at least 12 months with provisions for follow-up care; are comprehensive; involve the family or a family substitute; and use forms of therapy and skill-building shown to be most effective. For co-occurring disorders, integrated treatment is used.
- Program goals for adolescent clients include: maximizing motivation for abstinence and developing strategies for abstinence; learning skills necessary to achieve economic, educational, employment and social adequacy; and learning skills necessary for relapse prevention.
- Staff have, and effectively apply, training in how to work with youth with substance use problems and/or co-occurring disorders.
- Staff know and use effective strategies to engage and retain youth
- Records are kept to show the program dropout rate and reasons associated with adolescents discontinuing programming and staff use that information to improve program engagement and retention.
- Staff consider cultural factors when making placement decisions.
- Staff deliver services with fidelity to and compliance with the program objectives and treatment design.

1. Please discuss any supporting reasons for the **overall assessment ranking** you have provided and for the indicators you have identified that need improvement over time.

2. Please identify the key pieces of documentation that might support your ratings of the indicators and this element. These might include examples of assessment tools, client plans, staff resumes illustrating appropriate training, records on programmatic successes and dropouts, etc.

3. Please provide any comments about this element and its indicators that might be helpful in the development of the Action Plans.

**Dimension 4: Theoretical Basis for Intervention**

*Element 6: Staff Practice, Qualifications and Support (see p. 40 in Guidebook)*

<b>Overall Element Rating</b>	1	2	3	4	5	NA
<i>An overall assessment of element looking across the 7 indicators noted below</i>	We <b>don't do any</b> indicators and/or have room for improvement on <b>most or all</b> indicators	We do a <b>few</b> indicators, but could use improvement on <b>many</b> indicators	We do <b>some</b> of the indicators, but could use improvement on <b>some</b> indicators	We do <b>most</b> of the indicators and/or could use improvement on <b>only a few</b> indicators	We do <b>all</b> the indicators and/or need <b>no improvement</b> on the indicators	

Please note those indicators that aren't currently happening and/or need improvement on (*check all that apply*)

- Staff have worked in program for offenders for at least two years.
- Staff can identify the core skills of effective correctional treatment, and are regularly assessed on these skills.
- Staff have undergraduate and advanced degrees in helping professions, and resumes and/or biographical descriptions are available for review.
- Staff reflect the personal qualities necessary for strong relationships with clients.
- High retention rates for staff
- Staff receive initial and ongoing training in the core skills and managers keep a log of trainings received.
- Supervisors regularly interact with staff in clinical settings.

1. Please discuss any supporting reasons for the **overall assessment ranking** you have provided and for the indicators you have identified that need improvement over time.

2. Please identify the key pieces of documentation that might support your ratings of the indicators and this element. These might include examples of staff resumes, (anonymous) personnel reviews, etc.

3. Please provide any comments about this element and its indicators that might be helpful in the development of the Action Plans.

**Dimension 4: Theoretical Basis for Intervention**

*Element 7: Engagement, Motivation and Retention of Participants (see p. 42 in Guidebook)*

<b>Overall Element Rating</b>	1	2	3	4	5	NA
<i>An overall assessment of element looking across the 9 indicators noted below</i>	We <b>don't do any</b> indicators and/or have room for improvement on <b>most or all</b> indicators	We do a <b>few</b> indicators, but could use improvement on <b>many</b> indicators	We do <b>some</b> of the indicators, but could use improvement on <b>some</b> indicators	We do <b>most</b> of the indicators and/or could use improvement on <b>only a few</b> indicators	We do <b>all</b> the indicators and/or need <b>no improvement</b> on the indicators	

Please note those indicators that aren't currently happening and/or need improvement on (*check all that apply*)

- Engaging, motivating, and retaining participants are key concepts included in agency policies and procedures.
- Staff are trained in, and uses reframing and other proven clinical techniques that provide a positive context for change.
- Staff is trained in, and uses retention strategies including those listed above.
- Staff identifies youth and family strengths.
- Staff is matched with participants based on gender and ethnicity, when possible.
- Aspects of program interventions include those listed above, such as: building a positive alliance with participants, showing interest in hearing about participants experiences, showing respect to participants, and helping families feel in control during the intervention process.
- Program interventions initially focus on changing participants' barriers to engaging in the program
- Records of engagement and retention show the dropout rates are low at all stages and the completion rates are high.
- Client satisfaction surveys show that participants believe they benefited from their participation.

1. Please discuss any supporting reasons for the **overall assessment ranking** you have provided and for the indicators you have identified that need improvement over time.

2. Please identify the key pieces of documentation that might support your ratings of the indicators and this element. These might include examples (anonymous) case notes that identify barriers to engagement and strategies to encourage it, records of retention and dropout rates, summaries of client satisfaction surveys, etc.

3. Please provide any comments about this element and its indicators that might be helpful in the development of the Action Plans.

**Dimension 4: Theoretical Basis for Intervention**

*Element 8: Behavioral and Cognitive-Behavior Interventions (see p. 44 in Guidebook)*

<b>Overall Element Rating</b>	1	2	3	4	5	NA
<i>An overall assessment of element looking across the 6 indicators noted below</i>	We <b>don't do any</b> indicators and/or have room for improvement on <b>most or all</b> indicators	We do a <b>few</b> indicators, but could use improvement on <b>many</b> indicators	We do <b>some</b> of the indicators, but could use improvement on <b>some</b> indicators	We do <b>most</b> of the indicators and/or could use improvement on <b>only a few</b> indicators	We do <b>all</b> the indicators and/or need <b>no improvement</b> on the indicators	

Please note those indicators that aren't currently happening and/or need improvement on (*check all that apply*)

- Staff can describe the specific behaviors and cognitive shifts they are helping clients to achieve and the techniques they are using to achieve desired changes, focusing on those risk factors that are amenable to change.
- Staff enforce behavioral and reinforcement strategies in a fair manner.
- Staff use appropriate incentives.
- Staff can demonstrate that positive reinforcers are used at least four times as often as punitive reinforcers.
- Staff have training in effective behavioral and cognitive-behavioral techniques.
- Programs use multiple types of cognitive-behavioral interventions.

1. Please discuss any supporting reasons for the **overall assessment ranking** you have provided and for the indicators you have identified that need improvement over time.

2. Please identify the key pieces of documentation that might support your ratings of the indicators and this element. These might include examples of staff resumes showing competencies, descriptions of commonly used techniques, (anonymous) client records illustrating results, etc.

3. Please provide any comments about this element and its indicators that might be helpful in the development of the Action Plans.

**Dimension 4: Theoretical Basis for Intervention**

*Element 9: Interpersonal Skill Building and Other Skill-Oriented Interventions (see p. 47 in Guidebook)*

<b>Overall Element Rating</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>NA</b>
<i>An overall assessment of element looking across the 9 indicators noted below</i>	We <b>don't do any</b> indicators and/or have room for improvement on <b>most or all</b> indicators	We do a <b>few</b> indicators, but could use improvement on <b>many</b> indicators	We do <b>some</b> of the indicators, but could use improvement on <b>some</b> indicators	We do <b>most</b> of the indicators and/or could use improvement on <b>only a few</b> indicators	We do <b>all</b> the indicators and/or need <b>no improvement</b> on the indicators	

Please note those indicators that aren't currently happening and/or need improvement on (**check all that apply**)

- Staff assesses participants' needs and can explain why they chose the components of an implement individual skill development plan or approach and the techniques they are using to achieve skill acquisition.
- Family members, teachers, and peers are included in the development and implementation of intervention for participants.
- Staff can describe the subskills that must be mastered to acquire a larger skill and demonstrate how the subskills are taught.
- Staff can describe and demonstrate how they are using the basic instructional components listed above in their program.
- Staff can describe, based on verbal reports and observations, how their participants use taught skills in daily living and in a variety of situations.
- Staff teach culturally appropriate social skills.
- Staff are trained on the basic instructional components of social skills programs.
- Programs teach multiple types of social skills and utilize varied interventions.
- Program records document skill building interventions and skills acquired for each youth.

1. Please discuss any supporting reasons for the **overall assessment ranking** you have provided and for the indicators you have identified that need improvement over time.

2. Please identify the key pieces of documentation that might support your ratings of the indicators and this element. These might include examples of staff resumes showing competencies, (anonymous) case notes that illustrate engagement of family, school and/or community members in treatment, etc.

3. Please provide any comments about this element and its indicators that might be helpful in the development of the Action Plans.

**Dimension 4: Theoretical Basis for Intervention**

*Element 9a: Employment and Vocational Interventions (see p. 51 in Guidebook)*

<b>Overall Element Rating</b>	1	2	3	4	5	NA
<i>An overall assessment of element looking across the 6 indicators noted below</i>	We <b>don't do any</b> indicators and/or have room for improvement on <b>most or all</b> indicators	We do a <b>few</b> indicators, but could use improvement on <b>many</b> indicators	We do <b>some</b> of the indicators, but could use improvement on <b>some</b> indicators	We do <b>most</b> of the indicators and/or could use improvement on <b>only a few</b> indicators	We do <b>all</b> the indicators and/or need <b>no improvement</b> on the indicators	

Please note those indicators that aren't currently happening and/or need improvement on (*check all that apply*)

- Standardized academic and vocational skills assessments (if culturally appropriate) are used or reviewed to determine needs and goals for each youth and are periodically re-administered at logical and consistent intervals.
- Staff can describe and provide a written, individual development plan for each participant.
- Records of assessment are maintained and tracked in files in order to effectively gauge progress toward individualized development plans.
- Program staff can describe why the program provides a focus on vocational training or educational interventions or both and why the services offered will prepare participants for specific, attainable jobs in their community.
- Staff can describe and demonstrate how they are ensuring that participants have obtained the core competencies of job attainment, job survival, communication, leadership, teamwork, career development, personal self-development and problem solving. This may include pre- and post-program assessments completed by staff, youth, and work supervisors.
- Supervisors can demonstrate how staff is accountable for the success rates of participants.

1. Please discuss any supporting reasons for the **overall assessment ranking** you have provided and for the indicators you have identified that need improvement over time.

2. Please identify the key pieces of documentation that might support your ratings of the indicators and this element. These might include examples of assessment tools, client educational plans, progress reports, standardized records of achievement by clients, etc.

3. Please provide any comments about this element and its indicators that might be helpful in the development of the Action Plans.

**Dimension 4: Theoretical Basis for Intervention**

*Element 9b: Academic Skills and Training (see p. 53 in Guidebook)*

<b>Overall Element Rating</b>	1	2	3	4	5	NA
<i>An overall assessment of element looking across the 6 indicators noted below</i>	We <b>don't do any</b> indicators and/or have room for improvement on <b>most or all</b> indicators	We do a <b>few</b> indicators, but could use improvement on <b>many</b> indicators	We do <b>some</b> of the indicators, but could use improvement on <b>some</b> indicators	We do <b>most</b> of the indicators and/or could use improvement on <b>only a few</b> indicators	We do <b>all</b> the indicators and/or need <b>no improvement</b> on the indicators	

Please note those indicators that aren't currently happening and/or need improvement on (*check all that apply*)

- Standardized academic skills assessments are used or reviewed to determine the needs of each client.
- Academic program is tailored to the individual needs of each youth.
- Learning activities effectively engage youth.
- Records of assessments, individualized learning plans, and re-assessments are maintained and tracked in client files.
- Academic progress is monitored regularly.
- If youth are in school, information on academic progress observed and interventions needed is shared between program and school (to the extent that privacy laws allow).

1. Please discuss any supporting reasons for the **overall assessment ranking** you have provided and for the indicators you have identified that need improvement over time.

2. Please identify the key pieces of documentation that might support your ratings of the indicators and this element. These might include examples of academic assessment tools or school records, client educational plans, academic progress reports, standardized records of achievement by clients, etc.

3. Please provide any comments about this element and its indicators that might be helpful in the development of the Action Plans.

**Dimension 4: Theoretical Basis for Intervention**

*Element 10: Individual Therapy (see p. 55 in Guidebook)*

<b>Overall Element Rating</b>	1	2	3	4	5	NA
<i>An overall assessment of element looking across the 4 indicators noted below</i>	We <b>don't do any</b> indicators and/or have room for improvement on <b>most or all</b> indicators	We do a <b>few</b> indicators, but could use improvement on <b>many</b> indicators	We do <b>some</b> of the indicators, but could use improvement on <b>some</b> indicators	We do <b>most</b> of the indicators and/or could use improvement on <b>only a few</b> indicators	We do <b>all</b> the indicators and/or need <b>no improvement</b> on the indicators	

Please note those indicators that aren't currently happening and/or need improvement on (*check all that apply*)

- Therapists tailor treatment plans - with short-term and long-term goals and identified strategies for reaching each goal – to the individual needs of each youth.
- Therapists can describe their conceptualization of the problem (does it encompass biological, psychological, social/environmental, developmental or family factors?) and the specific issues they are attempting to treat and the approach they are utilizing to affect these changes (in ways that do not compromise counselor-client privacy ethics).
- Family members are involved appropriately in the development and implementation of treatment plans.
- Therapists are trained in individual therapy theories appropriate for adolescents and have experience working with adjudicated youth.

1. Please discuss any supporting reasons for the **overall assessment ranking** you have provided and for the indicators you have identified that need improvement over time.

2. Please identify the key pieces of documentation that might support your ratings of the indicators and this element. These might include examples of staff resumes showing competencies, (anonymous) client assessments, treatment plans, etc.

3. Please provide any comments about this element and its indicators that might be helpful in the development of the Action Plans.



**Dimension 4: Theoretical Basis for Intervention**

*Element 11: Family Therapy/Interventions (see p. 58 in Guidebook)*

<b>Overall Element Rating</b>	1	2	3	4	5	NA
<i>An overall assessment of element looking across the 6 indicators noted below</i>	We <b>don't do any</b> indicators and/or have room for improvement on <b>most or all</b> indicators	We do a <b>few</b> indicators, but could use improvement on <b>many</b> indicators	We do <b>some</b> of the indicators, but could use improvement on <b>some</b> indicators	We do <b>most</b> of the indicators and/or could use improvement on <b>only a few</b> indicators	We do <b>all</b> the indicators and/or need <b>no improvement</b> on the indicators	

Please note those indicators that aren't currently happening and/or need improvement on (*check all that apply*)

- Therapists can describe specific strategies for engaging and establishing rapport with the family and youth that are related to reducing recidivism and mitigating other problem patterns.
- Therapists can describe how they help the family and youth recognize their problem patterns.
- Therapists can describe how they use multiple, effective techniques (social development, cognitive-behavioral, etc.) to help the family and youth practice new behaviors.
- Family and youth are actively engaged in the process, as measured through attendance and through evaluation processes including surveys and therapeutic measurement tools.
- Family and youth demonstrate observable behavior modification, specifically in areas discussed in therapy sessions.
- Family and youth have an increased understanding of problem behaviors and how to change them.

1. Please discuss any supporting reasons for the **overall assessment ranking** you have provided and for the indicators you have identified that need improvement over time.

2. Please identify the key pieces of documentation that might support your ratings of the indicators and this element. These might include examples of (anonymous) client records showing family involvement, (anonymous) family behavior modification plans, etc.

3. Please provide any comments about this element and its indicators that might be helpful in the development of the Action Plans.

**Dimension 4: Theoretical Basis for Intervention**

*Element 12: Group Therapy (see p. 60 in Guidebook)*

<b>Overall Element Rating</b>	1	2	3	4	5	NA
<i>An overall assessment of element looking across the 6 indicators noted below</i>	We <b>don't do any</b> indicators and/or have room for improvement on <b>most or all</b> indicators	We do a <b>few</b> indicators, but could use improvement on <b>many</b> indicators	We do <b>some</b> of the indicators, but could use improvement on <b>some</b> indicators	We do <b>most</b> of the indicators and/or could use improvement on <b>only a few</b> indicators	We do <b>all</b> the indicators and/or need <b>no improvement</b> on the indicators	

Please note those indicators that aren't currently happening and/or need improvement on (*check all that apply*)

- The group design has specific objectives, with characteristics and activities that are effective in meeting the objectives, and which are measured on an ongoing basis.
- Participants are actively engaged in the group process, as measured through attendance and through evaluation processes including surveys and therapeutic measurement tools.
- Participants demonstrate observable behavior modification, specifically in areas discussed in group therapy sessions.
- Participants have an increased understanding of problem behaviors and how to change them.
- Therapists demonstrate a variety of styles suited to the personality and situation of participants.
- Therapists are trained in, and follow, professional guidelines for successful group counseling.

1. Please discuss any supporting reasons for the **overall assessment ranking** you have provided and for the indicators you have identified that need improvement over time.

2. Please identify the key pieces of documentation that might support your ratings of the indicators and this element. These might include examples of staff resumes showing competencies, group therapy plans, (anonymous) case notes, etc.

3. Please provide any comments about this element and its indicators that might be helpful in the development of the Action Plans.

**Dimension 4: Theoretical Basis for Intervention**

*Element 13: Multiple Services, Casework/Advocacy (see p. 62 in Guidebook)*

<b>Overall Element Rating</b>	1	2	3	4	5	NA
<i>An overall assessment of element looking across the 5 indicators noted below</i>	We <b>don't do any</b> indicators and/or have room for improvement on <b>most or all</b> indicators	We do a <b>few</b> indicators, but could use improvement on <b>many</b> indicators	We do <b>some</b> of the indicators, but could use improvement on <b>some</b> indicators	We do <b>most</b> of the indicators and/or could use improvement on <b>only a few</b> indicators	We do <b>all</b> the indicators and/or need <b>no improvement</b> on the indicators	

Please note those indicators that aren't currently happening and/or need improvement on (*check all that apply*)

- A case manager is assigned to each client, the manager rarely changes, and his/her caseload allows sufficient time for him/her to meet the needs of his/her clients.
- Staff can describe and provide a copy of an individual plan for each participant.
- Staff can describe a wide variety of services and supports that are routinely available to which they match clients.
- Staff can describe and provide a copy of records monitoring the progress of each participant, and demonstrate that changes in goals and services are made that are responsive to information received through reviewing relevant records.
- Families are appropriately involved in the development and implementation of individual plans, when applicable.

1. Please discuss any supporting reasons for the **overall assessment ranking** you have provided and for the indicators you have identified that need improvement over time.

2. Please identify the key pieces of documentation that might support your ratings of the indicators and this element. These might include examples of (anonymous) client casework plans, records of typical caseloads managed by staff, etc.

3. Please provide any comments about this element and its indicators that might be helpful in the development of the Action Plans.

**Dimension 4: Theoretical Basis for Intervention**

*Element 14: Wraparound Process (see p. 64 in Guidebook)*

<b>Overall Element Rating</b>	1	2	3	4	5	NA
<i>An overall assessment of element looking across the 5 indicators noted below</i>	We <b>don't do any</b> indicators and/or have room for improvement on <b>most or all</b> indicators	We do a <b>few</b> indicators, but could use improvement on <b>many</b> indicators	We do <b>some</b> of the indicators, but could use improvement on <b>some</b> indicators	We do <b>most</b> of the indicators and/or could use improvement on <b>only a few</b> indicators	We do <b>all</b> the indicators and/or need <b>no improvement</b> on the indicators	

For the method used to evaluate the Wraparound Process, please note those indicators that aren't currently happening and/or need improvement on (*check all that apply*)

- ➔ The **Wraparound Fidelity Index (WFI)** is an interview process that measures adherence during implementation to the recognized wraparound elements. WFI assesses the fidelity of implementation of a wraparound process by having the parent, youth and resource facilitator rate four items that are considered essential service delivery practices for each of the essential elements of wraparound listed above. For example, within the element of Voice and Choice, questions are:
  - Does the parent express their opinions even if they are different from the rest of the team?
  - Are important decisions about the youth and family made when the parent is not there?
  - Do team members “overrule” the parent’s wishes regarding the youth?
  - Does the parent make all major decisions about services and supports with help from the team?
- ➔ The **Checklist for Indicators of Practice and Planning (ChIPP)** provides a list of indicators of the extent to which teams demonstrate, during team meetings, that the necessary conditions (listed above) of a high-quality wraparound process are present. It can be used as a self-assessment or as an observational tool. For example, within the necessary condition of adhering to a practice model that promotes team cohesiveness and high quality planning in a manner consistent with the value base of wraparound, the indicators are:
  - Team adheres to meeting structures, techniques, and procedures that support high quality planning.
  - Team considers multiple alternatives before making decisions.
  - Team adheres to procedures, techniques and/or structures that work to counteract power imbalances between and among providers and families.
  - Team uses structures and techniques that lead all members to feel that their input is valued.
  - Team builds agreement around plans despite differing priorities and diverging mandates.
  - Team builds an appreciation of strengths.
  - Team planning reflects cultural competence.
- The **Wraparound Observation Form – Second Version (WOF-2)** was developed to reflect the delivery of services based on the wraparound approach to children and youth during team meetings in community-based systems of care. The WOF-2 is completed based on a user’s manual by an observer of the meeting. For example, within the characteristic of community-based resources, indicators are:
  - Information about resources/interventions in the area is offered to the team.
  - Plan of care includes at least one public and/or private community service/resource.
  - Plan of care includes at least one informal resource.
  - When residential placement is discussed, team chooses community placements for child(ren), rather than out-of-community placements, whenever possible.
  - Individuals (non-professionals) important to the family are present at the meeting.

1. Please discuss any supporting reasons for the **overall assessment ranking** you have provided and for the indicators you have identified that need improvement over time.

2. Please identify the key pieces of documentation that might support your ratings of the indicators and this element. These might include examples of assessment tools, (anonymous) sample assessments, etc.

3. Please provide any comments about this element and its indicators that might be helpful in the development of the Action Plans.

**Dimension 4: Theoretical Basis for Intervention**

*Element 15: Avoiding Programs with Mixed or Weak Effects (see p. 69 in Guidebook)*

Element/Indicator	Do you use it?	Do you evaluate its effectiveness?	Is it effective?	Follow-up: is it still being used?	Documentation of effectiveness? (Y/N) If "YES", how?
1. Wilderness challenge programs (e.g., Outward Bound and Vision Quest)					
2. Programs involving large groups of antisocial adolescents, especially in residential settings					
3. Aftercare (programs or activities designed to help juvenile offenders leaving an institution to reintegrate into the community)					

**Dimension 4: Theoretical Basis for Intervention**

*Element 16: Avoiding Programs that Don't Work (see p. 70 in Guidebook)*

Element/Indicator	Do you use it?	Do you evaluate its effectiveness?	Is it effective?	Follow-up: is it still being used?	Documentation of effectiveness? (Y/N) If "YES", how?
<p>1. Confrontation</p> <p>a. <i>Scared Straight/shock incarceration</i>: Brings youth into prisons and subjects them to some of the dynamics of prison life or uses other methods to expose them to the realities of incarceration as a deterrent.</p> <p>b. <i>Boot camps</i>: Requires incarcerated youth to follow the structure and live in the atmosphere of military inductions training camps, using discipline, drill and ceremony.</p>					
<p>2. Traditional psychodynamic, nondirective or client-centered therapies (as distinguished from individual therapy aimed at specific emotional or behavioral changes)</p> <p>a. Includes processes such as "talking" cures, unraveling the unconscious and gaining insight, fostering positive self-regard, externalizing blame to parents or society, ventilating anger</p> <p>b. Open and non-focused family counseling)</p>					
<p>3. Vague, unstructured rehabilitation programs</p>					

<p>4. Increasing cohesiveness of delinquent/criminal groups (allowing delinquent youth to bond with other delinquent youth in ways that could increase criminal behavior through peer influence)</p>					
<p>5. Targeting non-crime producing needs (e.g., self-esteem, depression, anxiety, vague emotional or personal problems)</p>					



**Dimension 5: Implement with Quality and Fidelity**

*Element 17: Implementation of Practice as Designed (see p. 73 in Guidebook)*

<b>Overall Element Rating</b>	1	2	3	4	5	NA
<i>An overall assessment of element looking across the 3 indicators noted below</i>	We <b>don't do any</b> indicators and/or have room for improvement on <b>most or all</b> indicators	We do a <b>few</b> indicators, but could use improvement on <b>many</b> indicators	We do <b>some</b> of the indicators, but could use improvement on <b>some</b> indicators	We do <b>most</b> of the indicators and/or could use improvement on <b>only a few</b> indicators	We do <b>all</b> the indicators and/or need <b>no improvement</b> on the indicators	

Please note those indicators that aren't currently happening and/or need improvement on (*check all that apply*)

- Staff understand and can identify specific, critical program design elements.
- Policies and procedures include instructions for on-going quality control processes, which may include site visits, additional staff training, and assessment.
- Staff use instruments, such as those named above, to track fidelity and these documents are filed for program review to document key components of program delivery.

1. Please discuss any supporting reasons for the **overall assessment ranking** you have provided and for the indicators you have identified that need improvement over time.

2. Please identify the key pieces of documentation that might support your ratings of the indicators and this element. These might include examples of program design descriptions paired with service delivery plans, descriptions of quality control procedures, examples of quality reviews, etc.

3. Please provide any comments about this element and its indicators that might be helpful in the development of the Action Plans.

**Dimension 5: Implement with Quality and Fidelity**

*Element 18: Sufficient Intensity and Duration (see p. 75 in Guidebook)*

<b>Overall Element Rating</b>	1	2	3	4	5	NA
<i>An overall assessment of element looking across the 2 indicators noted below</i>	We <b>don't do any</b> indicators and/or have room for improvement on <b>most or all</b> indicators	We do a <b>few</b> indicators, but could use improvement on <b>many</b> indicators	We do <b>some</b> of the indicators, but could use improvement on <b>some</b> indicators	We do <b>most</b> of the indicators and/or could use improvement on <b>only a few</b> indicators	We do <b>all</b> the indicators and/or need <b>no improvement</b> on the indicators	

Please note those indicators that aren't currently happening and/or need improvement on (*check all that apply*)

- The program articulates (in references; best practice protocols; or its own program evaluation results) evidence that the intensity and duration of the program activities are adequate to achieve the desired level of change. If the intensity or duration is less than that recommended for best practices, the program explains why it thinks the reduced intensity and/or duration will still be effective.
- The program keeps records of activities and attendance for each participant that demonstrate that most participants are receiving the planned minimum levels of intensity and duration even with anticipated average absences and service interruptions.

1. Please discuss any supporting reasons for the **overall assessment ranking** you have provided and for the indicators you have identified that need improvement over time.

2. Please identify the key pieces of documentation that might support your ratings of the indicators and this element. These might include examples of practice protocols, records of activities or attendance, etc.

3. Please provide any comments about this element and its indicators that might be helpful in the development of the Action Plans.

**Dimension 5: Implement with Quality and Fidelity**

*Element 19: Evaluation and Continuous Improvement (see p. 77 in Guidebook)*

<b>Overall Element Rating</b>	1	2	3	4	5	NA
<i>An overall assessment of element looking across the 9 indicators noted below</i>	We <b>don't do any</b> indicators and/or have room for improvement on <b>most or all</b> indicators	We do a <b>few</b> indicators, but could use improvement on <b>many</b> indicators	We do <b>some</b> of the indicators, but could use improvement on <b>some</b> indicators	We do <b>most</b> of the indicators and/or could use improvement on <b>only a few</b> indicators	We do <b>all</b> the indicators and/or need <b>no improvement</b> on the indicators	

Please note those indicators that aren't currently happening and/or need improvement on (*check all that apply*)

- Existence of a current written plan outlining a process for assessing and improving overall program performance, which assigns responsibilities and sets timelines for implementation.
- Existence of a current written plan developed with staff input that describes an outcomes measurement system for each program, including the outcome of customer satisfaction.
- Regular participation by stakeholders in an ongoing improvement process.
- A theory of change for the program and/or organization.
- A written logic model for each program, developed with staff input, and routinely updated.
- Appropriate outcomes, which contribute to the goal of reduced recidivism.
- Evaluation data are tracked in a system (such as computer spreadsheets or data bases) to allow comparisons of changes in individuals over time and comparisons of program outcomes over time or with different populations.
- Client recidivism is tracked for at least six months after clients leave the program.
- Documentation on how evaluation findings are used to improve performance and quality.

1. Please discuss any supporting reasons for the **overall assessment ranking** you have provided and for the indicators you have identified that need improvement over time.

2. Please identify the key pieces of documentation that might support your ratings of the indicators and this element. These might include examples of lists of anticipated program outcomes and indicators, program logic models, evaluation plans, data collection tools, outcome based evaluation data or reports, etc.

3. Please provide any comments about this element and its indicators that might be helpful in the development of the Action Plans.

## Supports and Resources Surrounding the Intervention

*Element 20: Agency Mission (see p. 84 in Guidebook)*

<b>Overall Element Rating</b>	1	2	3	4	5	NA
<i>An overall assessment of element looking across the 4 indicators noted below</i>	We <b>don't do any</b> indicators and/or have room for improvement on <b>most or all</b> indicators	We do a <b>few</b> indicators, but could use improvement on <b>many</b> indicators	We do <b>some</b> of the indicators, but could use improvement on <b>some</b> indicators	We do <b>most</b> of the indicators and/or could use improvement on <b>only a few</b> indicators	We do <b>all</b> the indicators and/or need <b>no improvement</b> on the indicators	

Please note those indicators that aren't currently happening and/or need improvement on (*check all that apply*)

- Written mission statement that clearly defines the role and purpose of the organization, as well as how it intends to serve its stakeholders/target population.
- Program is designed based on clear priorities and goals developed from mission statement; coherent links are evident.
- Mission statement is included in program materials; it is regularly communicated to staff, board, participants, and other stakeholders.
- Mission statement is reviewed every five years, and revised as necessary

1. Please discuss any supporting reasons for the **overall assessment ranking** you have provided and for the indicators you have identified that need improvement over time.

2. Please identify the key pieces of documentation that might support your ratings of the indicators and this element. These might include examples of mission statement, goals lists (planned and achieved), strategic plans, etc.

3. Please provide any comments about this element and its indicators that might be helpful in the development of the Action Plans.

**Supports and Resources Surrounding the Intervention**  
*Element 21: Agency Leadership (see p. 85 in Guidebook)*

<b>Overall Element Rating</b>	1	2	3	4	5	NA
<i>An overall assessment of element looking across the 4 indicators noted below</i>	We <b>don't do any</b> indicators and/or have room for improvement on <b>most or all</b> indicators	We do a <b>few</b> indicators, but could use improvement on <b>many</b> indicators	We do <b>some</b> of the indicators, but could use improvement on <b>some</b> indicators	We do <b>most</b> of the indicators and/or could use improvement on <b>only a few</b> indicators	We do <b>all</b> the indicators and/or need <b>no improvement</b> on the indicators	

Please note those indicators that aren't currently happening and/or need improvement on (*check all that apply*)

- Board membership includes people with skills and knowledge in financial management and organizational management, and reflects a diversity of additional skills and knowledge important to the organization.
- Leadership skills, and other associated requirements, needed for staff positions are included in job descriptions and program policies and procedures.
- Qualifications and job responsibilities for program leaders include: three years of experience working with offenders, training in a helping profession, and knowledge of program design and implementation, involvement in staff hiring and training, and some direct service provision.
- Initial and on-going leadership training for head executive and program leaders.

1. Please discuss any supporting reasons for the **overall assessment ranking** you have provided and for the indicators you have identified that need improvement over time.

2. Please identify the key pieces of documentation that might support your ratings of the indicators and this element. These might include examples of descriptions of Board members assets or activities for the organization, job descriptions describing leadership expectations, leadership training undertaken by staff or Board members, etc.

3. Please provide any comments about this element and its indicators that might be helpful in the development of the Action Plans.

## Supports and Resources Surrounding the Intervention

*Element 22: Agency Funding and Financial Management (see p. 87 in Guidebook)*

<b>Overall Element Rating</b>	1	2	3	4	5	NA
<i>An overall assessment of element looking across the 8 indicators noted below</i>	We <b>don't do any</b> indicators and/or have room for improvement on <b>most or all</b> indicators	We do a <b>few</b> indicators, but could use improvement on <b>many</b> indicators	We do <b>some</b> of the indicators, but could use improvement on <b>some</b> indicators	We do <b>most</b> of the indicators and/or could use improvement on <b>only a few</b> indicators	We do <b>all</b> the indicators and/or need <b>no improvement</b> on the indicators	

Please note those indicators that aren't currently happening and/or need improvement on (**check all that apply**)

- Governing board has developed and implemented a long-range funding plan with assigned responsibilities and timelines.
- Financial resources are leveraged through collaboration.
- Governing board regularly monitors financial status of program.
- Chief Executive Officer regularly reports to the governing board regarding financial status, anticipated problems, financial planning, and funding options.
- Program services are priced to be affordable to target population.
- Staff manage financial affairs of program utilizing sound fiscal management practices and applicable legal and professional requirements.
- Staff involved in seeking and managing funds have experience in fund development and financial management skills.
- Stable and predictable sources of revenue are sought and retained.

1. Please discuss any supporting reasons for the **overall assessment ranking** you have provided and for the indicators you have identified that need improvement over time.

2. Please identify the key pieces of documentation that might support your ratings of the indicators and this element. These might include examples of funding plans, balance sheets, development plans, cost summaries, etc.

3. Please provide any comments about this element and its indicators that might be helpful in the development of the Action Plans.

**Supports and Resources Surrounding the Intervention**

*Element 23: Community Support (see p. 89 in Guidebook)*

<b>Overall Element Rating</b>	1	2	3	4	5	NA
<i>An overall assessment of element looking across the 5 indicators noted below</i>	We <b>don't do any</b> indicators and/or have room for improvement on <b>most or all</b> indicators	We do a <b>few</b> indicators, but could use improvement on <b>many</b> indicators	We do <b>some</b> of the indicators, but could use improvement on <b>some</b> indicators	We do <b>most</b> of the indicators and/or could use improvement on <b>only a few</b> indicators	We do <b>all</b> the indicators and/or need <b>no improvement</b> on the indicators	

Please note those indicators that aren't currently happening and/or need improvement on (*check all that apply*)

- Community education and support-seeking activities are noted as specific tasks and responsibilities in appropriate staff job descriptions, policies and procedures, and materials describing board roles.
- Program has advisory and/or governing boards that reflect community interest groups and that are involved in program activities and policy development.
- Levels of community support are regularly measured.
- Levels of knowledge among stakeholder groups regarding organization's purpose, function, and role are regularly measured.
- Community advocacy and education activities are routinely carried out among stakeholder groups.

1. Please discuss any supporting reasons for the **overall assessment ranking** you have provided and for the indicators you have identified that need improvement over time.

2. Please identify the key pieces of documentation that might support your ratings of the indicators and this element. These might include examples of community survey results, lists of stakeholders and their interest relative to the organization, lists of advocates for the organization, etc.

3. Please provide any comments about this element and its indicators that might be helpful in the development of the Action Plans.

## Supports and Resources Surrounding the Intervention

*Element 24: Connections across Programs and Services (see p. 91 in Guidebook)*

<b>Overall Element Rating</b>	1	2	3	4	5	NA
<i>An overall assessment of element looking across the 9 indicators noted below</i>	We <b>don't do any</b> indicators and/or have room for improvement on <b>most or all</b> indicators	We do a <b>few</b> indicators, but could use improvement on <b>many</b> indicators	We do <b>some</b> of the indicators, but could use improvement on <b>some</b> indicators	We do <b>most</b> of the indicators and/or could use improvement on <b>only a few</b> indicators	We do <b>all</b> the indicators and/or need <b>no improvement</b> on the indicators	

Please note those indicators that aren't currently happening and/or need improvement on (*check all that apply*)

- Regular trainings for staff regarding available services and supports.
- Assessments of clients are designed to identify services needed beyond what the program can provide.
- Networking with other agencies is included as a specific task in staff job descriptions and agency policies and procedures.
- Service coordination activities, as noted above, are routinely carried out by agency staff.
- Agency is involved in appropriate service collaborations.
- Continuum of services and integrated systems concepts are included in agency materials and supported by staff and the governing body.
- Staff educate participants about services and supports available to them in the community.
- Intake or other client records indicate other services received, other organizations engaged, contact staff and phone numbers.
- Records show referrals or consultation notes made during the program and whether client received services to which they are referred.

1. Please discuss any supporting reasons for the **overall assessment ranking** you have provided and for the indicators you have identified that need improvement over time.

2. Please identify the key pieces of documentation that might support your ratings of the indicators and this element. These might include examples of staff training schedules, lists of typical organizations used in referrals, lists of organizations with which the organization cooperates, (anonymous) client records of referrals, etc.

3. Please provide any comments about this element and its indicators that might be helpful in the development of the Action Plans.



**Evaluation Form  
for  
The Program Assessment and Implementation Planning Guide**

Thank you for using this assessment process for the Guidebook to Elements of Successful Programs. Since we are seeking input that we hope will help us improve this tool, we would like your feedback now that you have used the Assessment and Improvement Plan. Please answer the questions below and send this form to:

Maure Carrier  
King County Community Services Division  
821 Second Avenue, Suite 500  
Seattle, WA 98104  
E-mail: [maure.carrier@metrokc.gov](mailto:maure.carrier@metrokc.gov)  
Phone: 206-205-3048 FAX: 206-205-6565

Please also attach copies of:

- A. Your program description page from this document (page 6) and
- B. Your selection of elements to review (page 7).

Thanks!!

1. Were you assessing a single program or more than one that are part of a single organization?

- Single program       Multiple Programs (How many? \_\_\_\_\_ )

***Thinking collectively about all of the elements you evaluated***, please answer the following questions. For each question, please circle the number that best represents your opinion or write in the numbers requested.

<b>For all elements combined:</b>					
	<b>Not at all clear</b>				<b>Very clear</b>
2. How would you rate the overall <i>clarity of the elements (as described in the guidebook) as a whole</i> (i.e., how easy was it to understand what was written)?	0	1	2	3	4
	<b>Not at all meaningful</b>				<b>Very meaningful</b>
3. In general, how <i>meaningful are the numbered indicators as a whole</i> that describe these elements (i.e., how well do they describe these elements for a program serving highly at-risk youth)?	0	1	2	3	4
4. Which <i>elements are especially meaningful in helping describe how your program works</i> (i.e., in showing that your program is likely to be successful) (list numbers in space at right)?					

5. Which <i>elements</i> are <i>not meaningful</i> or <i>only marginally meaningful in helping describe how your program works</i> (i.e., in showing that your program is likely to be successful) (list numbers in space at right)?					
	<b>Not at all reasonable</b>				<b>Very reasonable</b>
6. There is a request for documentation that illustrates your organization's or your staff members' competency or effectiveness with regard to the indicators. In general, <i>how reasonable</i> is it to assume that an organization like yours have, provide, or create the documentation requested <i>for all of these elements combined</i> ?	0	1	2	3	4
	<b>Not at all useful</b>				<b>Very useful</b>
7. <i>How useful</i> was this assessment process to your organization in gaining insights into what you do well, where there might be room for improvement, and how well you document your program and results?	0	1	2	3	4

8. What suggestions do you have for improving the guidebook?

9. What suggestions do you have for improving this assessment process?

10. How do you intend to use what (if anything) you have learned about your organization to improve your documentation or your programs?

11. What is your name? \_\_\_\_\_

12. What is your job title? \_\_\_\_\_

13. May we contact you with follow-up questions?

No       Yes (phone number: \_\_\_\_\_ email: \_\_\_\_\_ )

Please also attach copies of:

- A. Your program description page from this document (page 6) and
- B. Your selection of elements to review (page 7).

Thank you!!