



Annual Outcomes and Year-End Program Progress Report

Due July 31

Organization and Program Name:	Juvenile Rights Project, SchoolWorks
Annual Period of this Report:	July 1, 2009 – June 30, 2010

Instructions:

This form has been designed specifically for your Children's Levy-funded program. There are five sections to complete:

- I. Service Activities Provided
- II. Program Participation by Children & Families
- III. Participant Outcomes
- IV. Reflection on Outcomes Evaluation Process
- V. Other Program Performance Information and Discussion

In each section you will find questions followed by a box in which to type your answers. The boxes will adjust in size as you type in them; everything that you type will be visible in the report. Please submit this form to **your grant manager** via email at the address listed below by July 31. If you experience difficulty with this form or with submission, please contact your grant manager.

Reminder: Demographic reports and Participant Lists are DUE with this report.

Lisa Hansell, Grant Manager
(503) 823-4133
lisa.hansell@portlandoregon.gov

Remember: Late reports will result in a financial penalty of 3% reduction in payment on grant invoice (per section IV.E. of the grant contract).

SECTION I: SERVICE ACTIVITIES PROVIDED

A. Table

Referring to Section II.B of the grant contract, complete the table below on program service activities provided during the contract year.

NOTE: The data presented in the table must reflect the entire program year.

Table 1 of Section I: Level of Service Provided as Compared to Contract Goals

Program Component	Number of Children to be Served (annual goal)	Actual Number Served during reporting period	% of Annual Contract Goal Achieved
Legal advocacy and case management	142 children	129 children	90.8%

Based on the information provided in the table above, did the program provide the level of services described in the grant contract for the contract year? Discuss any challenges and successes the program has encountered in delivering services at the level described in the contract (level of service refers to number of children served, amount of service offered by the program). Note: if actual numbers are significantly higher or lower than contract goals, please be sure to explain why.

Possible Factors Affecting Service Level may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Client outreach and recruitment, client eligibility requirements, and referrals
- Schedule and/or space changes at program sites including schools or other community sites
- Staff turnover or inability to find qualified staff to fill positions
- Lack of training for staff to implement program components or curriculum
- Accommodating high need children/families or children with disabilities
- Low participation that indicates a need to make a scheduling or service level change, or a need to make a service component change
- Low client participation in the form of cancellations and no-shows for scheduled services
- Other factors beyond the programs' control (e.g. inclement weather, facility maintenance)

(Note: The size of the boxes below will adjust as you type in them.)

For the last eight years, SchoolWorks has served children in the child welfare and juvenile justice systems. Cases are referred to SchoolWorks by the court-appointed attorneys for children and youth. JRP serves children in the child welfare system more broadly, including not only children in "foster care" but also children who are under the legal custody of DHS yet who remain at home; children informally placed with relatives under a safety plan; children placed for adoption, until the adoption is finalized; children placed in permanent guardianships with relatives or former foster parents; and children who are returned home from foster care but remain wards of the court. The PCL grant program limits eligibility to children in foster care, yet we find that the educational needs of children involved in the child welfare system are very similar, whether they are technically in foster care or not. Because the program has historically served children in the child welfare system more broadly (and continues to serve

these additional children with other funds), we were not able to accurately predict the number who would meet the PCL's new criteria for the foster care funding stream. During this year, we served 13 fewer children who met these criteria than we had projected. SchoolWorks did serve at least 142 children in Portland who are involved in the child welfare system during the past year.

SchoolWorks will continue to prioritize referrals for children who are in foster care and who attend school in the City of Portland during years two and three of the current grant.

B. Other Contractual Obligations

Discuss any issues or challenges in implementing the following other aspects of the program described in Section II.A of the contract:

- Reaching target and/or eligible populations: children in foster care, ages 4-21, who are having problems related to school attendance or enrollment, academic progress or behavior in school.
- Anticipated referral sources: referrals from Juvenile Rights Project attorneys

In 2006-2008, JRP received leverage funds for SchoolWorks and was able to serve children and youth in Portland. In 2009, JRP applied for funding under the Foster Care program, as roughly 80% of our clients are in the child welfare system. We recognize that the foster care funding is intended for children in foster care. There are, however, many other children in the child welfare system who are not technically in a DHS foster home, who are also vulnerable and in need of support. These include children in the legal custody of DHS who remain at home, children placed in guardianships or informal care arrangements with relatives, and other circumstances. We hope that the PCL Allocation Committee will consider broadening the eligibility criteria for this funding program to encompass other dependent children who have experienced abuse and neglect, including those who are in the temporary legal custody of DHS and/or wards of the court, but who technically are not in "foster care" at the time they are served by our program or other PCL foster care program grantees.

C. Other Aspects of Program Implementation

Discuss any other successes and challenges of other aspects of day-to-day program implementation so that the grant manager can gain an understanding of program delivery on the ground level.

SchoolWorks continues to be effective in advocating for students. In some cases, it takes longer than we would like to achieve the results we are seeking. Cuts to school district budgets, particularly in the area of special education, will likely make the situation more challenging. This program was created with the recognition that foster children and other vulnerable children often suffer the most in the face of limited public resources for education.

SECTION II: PROGRAM PARTICIPATION BY CHILDREN & FAMILIES

A. Table

Referring to Section III.A of the grant contract, please complete the tables below on children's and/or parent/families' participation in the program and their meeting of the participation floors for outcomes. *Note: In the first table below, you are being asked to restate some of the figures from the service activities Table 1 of Section I above.*

Table 1 of Section II: Total Unduplicated Participants	Number Served
Total Unduplicated Children Served during the Reporting Year	129

	Number meeting participation datapoint	Percent meeting participation datapoint
Table 2 of Section II: Participation in the Program		
<i>General</i>		
Number of case closures this grant year	94	
Range of months children were engaged in services at time of case closure	0.1 - 18.63 mos.	
Average number of months children were engaged in services at time of case closure	7.5 mos.	
Table 3 of Section II: Participation Floor(s) for Outcomes		
Children whose cases did not close prematurely due to any of the following: child discharged from foster care; child placed outside of program service area; child runs away; child or parent refuses program services; or child placed in a residential facility or other institution.	76	80%

B. Analysis of Participation below Minimum Expectations

- State the total number of participants that did not reach the participation floor(s). List the reasons that participants did not reach the participation floor. For each reason listed, provide the number of participants that did not reach the floor for that reason. (For example: a total of 10 children did not meet the participation floor for outcomes; of the 10 children, 3 enrolled too late in the year and did not complete services to be counted in meeting the floor, 6 children did not to continue services due to moving out of the service area, 1 did not complete the assessment tools to be counted in the outcomes)

Cases for 18 children closed before services were completed. These included 6 children whose cases were closed or dismissed by the court, 8 children who left the county, and 4 children who were placed in residential facilities. In many of these cases, some of the desired outcomes had been achieved, even though the case may have closed before all services were complete.

A. Table

Complete the table below. *Reminder: The percent of participants meeting the outcome should be calculated as the portion that met the outcome out of the total participants that met the participation floor for each outcome.*

	Number meeting Participation Floor for Outcome
Restate the number of participants meeting the participation floor for this outcome (Participation floor for Outcome #1 & Outcome #2: All Closed Cases)	94

Table 1 of Section III: Outcomes	Number meeting Outcome	Ratio of Number meeting Outcome to Number meeting Participation Floor	Percent meeting Outcome
Outcome #1 Goal: 75% of program participants who lack school stability* will improve school stability			
<u>Program Results:</u>			
Participants identified as not being enrolled in school	8	8/94	9%
Participants who are enrolled in school	8	8/8	100%
Participants who faced possible school moves	8	8/94	9%
Participants for whom school disruption was prevented	6	6/8	75%
Participants who required a more appropriate school placement	21	21/94	22%
Participants who obtained a more appropriate school placement	20	20/21	95%
Participants who were facing suspension/expulsion from school	3	3/94	3%
Participants for whom suspension/expulsion was reduced or avoided	2	2/3	67%
Outcome #2 Goal: 75% of program participants who are academically behind will increase academic success			
<u>Program Results:</u>			
Participants who were academically behind	31	31/94	33%
Participants with improved academic achievement	28	28/31	90%
Participants who had challenges with behavior in school	34	34/94	36%
Participants demonstrating improved behavior in school	32	32/34	94%
Participants with challenges with school attendance	10	10/94	11%
Participants with reduced school absences	9	9/10	90%

Table 2 of Section III: Outcomes		Number of all closed cases	Percent of all closed cases
Other Outcomes – All closed cases			
<u>Program Results:</u>			
Participants needing new/updated school plans.		34	36%
Participants receiving new/updated school plans.		33	97%
Participants needing establishment of Special Ed/504 eligibility		15	16%
Participants receiving newly established Special Ed/504 eligibility		14	93%
Participants needing new services (e.g. speech therapy, counseling, educational aide)		8	9%
Participants receiving new services (e.g. speech therapy, counseling, educational aide)		8	100%
Participants needing an earlier less severe disciplinary action (e.g. behavior plan)		1	1%
Participants receiving earlier less severe disciplinary action (e.g. behavior plan)		1	100%
Participants needing reduction in juvenile court events		0	0
Participants receiving reduction in juvenile court events		0	0
Participants needing cross system coordination		17	18%
Participants receiving cross system coordination		17	100%

1. METHODOLOGY

For each outcome measured, please indicate the name of tool used to assess participants for the outcome(s), when the tool was administered, who performed the assessment with the participants, and how it was determined whether or not the participants met the outcome(s).

SchoolWorks developed an outcome tool with researchers from Portland State University in 2002-2003. This form is completed by the assigned attorney or social worker at case closing. SchoolWorks staff may refer to grade reports, attendance reports or IEP progress reports from the students' schools to assess progress on some of the goals above. Information may also come from teachers, other school staff, foster parents or case workers.

2. ANALYSIS

a. How do the actual program outcome results compare to the outcome goals stated in the grant contract? Why do you think this is the case?

Success on these goals generally meets or exceeds the levels set in the contract. Success rates are high due not only to the skill and experience of our staff, but also due to the amount of time that we are able to spend on each case. Because JRP and SchoolWorks may be involved in a foster child's life for several months or several years, we have a greater opportunity to achieve the goals we set. We can also continue serving a student beyond the end of a single school year. It is also worth noting that SchoolWorks staff will often keep a case open as long as it takes to achieve the goals identified, except in those cases when services have to end for reasons outside of our control.

b. What have you learned about the participants served in the program as a result of tracking these outcomes (what trends or changes have you observed in tracking these data)?

The needs of children in foster care can be particularly acute and complex. In many cases, it has taken several months of work to achieve the outcomes above. For 27% of the students served during the grant year, services were not yet complete as of June 30, 2010. Efforts on behalf of these students will continue into the new school year.

There was a small number of students for whom "preventing suspension or expulsion" was identified. In most cases, this is tracked for students facing expulsion. Schools can suspend students immediately and without a hearing. The term of a suspension can be no longer than 10 days. Thus, a short suspension may conclude before SchoolWorks is notified or before our staff can respond. SchoolWorks may prevent future suspensions by helping to develop positive behavioral interventions with the school, but it is difficult to quantify when a suspension doesn't happen. When a student faces expulsion, however, the school must provide notice and conduct a hearing. This process provides SchoolWorks greater opportunity to intervene and impact the outcome.

In this particular group of children the number of different needs identified per child is fewer than we have seen in previous cohorts of children served. It may not be possible to know the reasons for this, however, we know that, over time, SchoolWorks has had a positive, system-wide impact. Schools are more likely to recognize the special needs of students in foster care than they were when the program started. DHS case workers and foster parents are also more aware of the barriers students face and how to get assistance for them. Transportation funds for children in foster care have been allocated to DHS, and statutory changes promoted by JRP in 2005 allow greater school stability for these children. School districts are also beginning to reconsider "zero tolerance" discipline policies that were established a decade ago and which have disproportionately affected the students SchoolWorks serves.

SECTION IV: REFLECTION ON THE OUTCOMES EVALUATION PROCESS

- A. Do you plan to make any changes to the program(s) in response to the outcome data? If so, describe the changes and the rationale.

The outcome data does not indicate a need to make changes to the program. We continue to strive to make sure that the data collected is as complete as possible.

- B. What changes are you planning to make, if any, to how you track outcomes and evaluate the program and why?

The SchoolWorks staff had our first meeting with the PSU researchers contracted with PCL to provide technical assistance on data collection and evaluation. One possibility that we discussed was disconnecting the case closing process with our outcomes tracking. The periods of time that different SchoolWorks cases remain open can vary widely. When cases do not close on a routine schedule, we have less outcome data when it is time to report. In addition, when cases remain open one year or longer, it becomes more difficult to capture all of the outcomes that occurred during the course of a case. We will discuss the possibility of collecting outcomes at a point-in-time every year on all cases, regardless of whether they are closed or not. This would likely require a reconsideration of the participation floor, as well.

- C. What challenges did you encounter tracking outcomes and creating this report?

It is a strength of the program that we can respond to such a wide variety of students' academic, social, emotional and behavioral needs, yet it has always been a challenge to collect data consistently when the number of needs that the program addresses is so varied. It also takes additional time to prepare this report because PCL specifically funds services for a subset of the population served by the program and the data must be extracted for these children, versus the larger population served by SchoolWorks.

- D. What was helpful or beneficial about tracking these outcomes for you and your program?

It is helpful to review the needs that were most prevalent for the group of children served this year. It is also useful to consider the goals in which we were most successful as well as those goals where our success rates were relatively lower.

- E. What further technical assistance related to evaluation capacity (defining, tracking, measuring, and reporting outcomes) might you need?

We look forward to working with the evaluation consultants and with our program officer on the issue discussed above in section B.

SECTION V: OTHER PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION & DISCUSSION

A. Staffing Update

1. Staff Turnover

Complete the table below regarding staff changes (for any staff positions paid by CITY grant funds).

Table 1 of Section V. Staff Turnover	Job Title of Positions	Turn –Over during Contract Year? (yes or no)	How many times did position turn over during Year?	How many total weeks did position remain empty during Year?
Direct Service Staff <i>(defined as working face-to-face with children and families)</i>	Attorney	No		
	Attorney	No		
	Attorney	No		
	Legal Assistant	No		
	Social Worker	No		
Management Staff <i>(defined as having supervisory responsibilities of direct service staff and management responsibilities for the program)</i>	Supervising Attorney	No		
	Executive Director	No		
	Systems Administrator	No		

2. Impact of Turnover on Program

Briefly discuss the impact that the staff turnover had on the program during the contract year.

N/A

B. Participant Success Stories

Please include only one participant success story from the contract year. The story should be unique, well developed, and compelling. We use these stories to help gain media coverage for the Children's Levy and for the programs we fund. *(Note: if you reported a participant success story at the mid-year report, you do not need to include another success story unless you would like to do so. If you do not feel like you have a compelling story to share at this time, then please do not complete this section of the report.)*

RALPH — 5th Grade

Ralph is in foster care and in the process of being adopted, but his adoptive mother had been struggling to get his school to provide an appropriate education for him. Ralph has a history of many behavior problems, and his school had relegated him to spending his days in a small room, removed from other classmates. He saw his teacher for only brief instances each day. Most of the day, he had an aide watching over him. For Ralph, this was a recipe for failure. He became easily frustrated. The school was also physically restraining Ralph unnecessarily and in ways that violated state policies, adding to Ralph's toxic experience at school. This pattern repeated over a period of months. SchoolWorks became involved and demanded that the school come up with a better plan for Ralph. The district agreed to obtain training for its staff in Collaborative Problem Solving. Ralph's SchoolWorks attorney also persuaded the school to use physical restraints only in instances where Ralph's behavior might pose a risk to his safety or the safety of others and to implement a behavior plan that focuses on positive interactions and incentives. After the plan was implemented, the use of physical interventions with Ralph dropped by 93%. His attorney also convinced the school to allow Ralph to spend part of the day in a special education classroom with other students. While the school staff feared that this would have disastrous results, instead Ralph thrived in his new class. By the end of the school year, Ralph was successfully attending classes with other students and the school plans to continue to transition Ralph to more mainstream classes in the fall.