



DC YouthLink Quarterly Performance Report

Fourth Quarter, FY 2011

Department of Youth Rehabilitation Services
Government of the District of Columbia

Table of Contents

DC YouthLink FY2011 Initiative Scorecard	1
DC YouthLink FY2011Q4 Initiative Scorecard	2
Salient Trends in the FY2011 4 th Quarter Data.....	3
Overview of Youth Engagement.....	3
Public Safety	5
Relationships.....	7
Work	7
Education	8
Health.....	9
Community & Creativity	9
About the DC YouthLink Initiative	10
The Oversight Process	11
The Role of Standardized and Data-Driven Oversight	11
Overview of the Report’s Framework and Methodology	11
Interpreting the Data Tables in the Report.....	15
Index of Tables	17
Data Tables	19

DC YouthLink Scorecard

Fiscal Year 2011



Service Delivery	Baseline						Δ
	Baseline	value	ERCPCP	PLC	Total		
Youth Served	FY2010	594	496	291	756	27%	
Service Linkages per Youth during Fiscal Year	FY2010	1.6	2.6	2.4	2.6	63%	▲
Service Linkages per Discharged Youth	FY2010	1.8	3.4	3.1	3.3	83%	▲
Avg Weekly Hours of Youth Engagement	-	-	5.1	7.3	6.0	-	

Public Safety	Baseline						Δ
	Baseline	value	ERCPCP	PLC	Total		
Youth Killed	FY2010	8	4	4	8	0%	▬
Youth Charged with Murder	FY2010	5	1	1	2	-60%	▲
Youth Re-Arrested (%)	-	-	32%	31%	32%	-	
Youth Re-Petitioned (%)	-	-	28%	28%	28%	-	
Youth Revoked (%)	FY2010	12%	10%	7%	9%	-25%	▲
Youth who Absconded (%)	FY2010	31%	30%	33%	30%	-3%	▬
Youth on Abscondence - single day snapshot (%)	FY2010	9%	6%	6%	6%	-33%	▲

Relationships	Baseline						Δ
	Baseline	value	ERCPCP	PLC	Total		
Enrollments (#)	FY2010	209	362	179	528	153%	▲
Enrollments (%)	FY2010	65%	73%	62%	70%	7%	▲
Avg Weekly Hours of Engagement	-	-	3.5	4.1	3.7	-	

Work	Baseline						Δ
	Baseline	value	ERCPCP	PLC	Total		
Enrollments (#)	FY2010	63	115	88	200	217%	▲
Enrollments (%)	FY2010	11%	23%	30%	26%	150%	▲
Avg Weekly Hours of Engagement	-	-	2.8	4.9	3.6	-	

Education	Baseline						Δ
	Baseline	value	ERCPCP	PLC	Total		
Enrollments (#)	FY2010	88	173	94	265	201%	▲
Enrollments (%)	FY2010	15%	35%	32%	35%	134%	▲
Avg Weekly Hours of Engagement	-	-	4.5	5.1	4.6	-	
Youth Achieving High School Credential	-	-	11	0	11	-	

Health	Baseline						Δ
	Baseline	value	ERCPCP	PLC	Total		
Enrollments (#)	FY2010	65	136	57	190	192%	▲
Enrollments (%)	FY2010	11%	30%	22%	28%	155%	▲
Avg Weekly Hours of Engagement	-	-	3.6	4.9	3.9	-	

Community	Baseline						Δ
	Baseline	value	ERCPCP	PLC	Total		
Enrollments (#)	FY2010	1	2	1	3	200%	▲
Enrollments (%)	FY2010	0.2%	0.4%	0.3%	0.4%	136%	▲
Avg Weekly Hours of Engagement	-	-	-	-	-	-	

Creativity	Baseline						Δ
	Baseline	value	ERCPCP	PLC	Total		
Enrollments (#)	FY2010	8	12	0	12	50%	▲
Enrollments (%)	FY2010	2%	2%	0%	2%	-21%	▬
Avg Weekly Hours of Engagement	-	-	-	-	-	-	

DC YouthLink Scorecard

Fiscal Year 2011, Fourth Quarter



Service Delivery	Baseline	Baseline					Δ	
		value	ERCPCP	PLC	Total			
Youth Served	PFQA	506	264	149	407	-20%		
Service Linkages per Youth during Quarter	PFQA	2.3	2.1	2.2	2.2	-5%	—	
Service Linkages per Discharged Youth	PFQA	2.8	4.3	3.4	4	45%	▲	
Avg Weekly Hours of Youth Engagement	FY11 Q3	7.6	6.0	4.6	5.9	-22%	▼	

Public Safety	Baseline	Baseline					Δ	
		value	ERCPCP	PLC	Total			
Youth Killed	PFQA	2.5	0	1	1	-60%	▲	
Youth Charged with Murder	PFQA	0.75	0	0	0	-100%	▲	
Youth Re-Arrested (%)	FY11 Q3	17%	24%	23%	24%	41%	▼	
Youth Re-Petitioned (%)	FY11 Q3	15%	21%	21%	21%	40%	▼	
Youth Revoked	PFQA	5%	3%	5%	3%	-35%	▲	
Youth who Absconded (%)	PFQA	14%	12%	14%	12%	-13%	▲	
Youth on Abscondence - single day snapshot (%)	PFQA	7%	3%	3%	3%	-61%	▲	

Relationships	Baseline	Baseline					Δ	
		value	ERCPCP	PLC	Total			
Enrollments (#)	PFQA	270	185	88	271	1%	—	
Enrollments (%)	PFQA	54%	70%	59%	67%	25%	▲	
Avg Weekly Hours of Engagement	FY11 Q3	4.8	3.8	4.2	3.9	-19%	▼	

Work	Baseline	Baseline					Δ	
		value	ERCPCP	PLC	Total			
Enrollments (#)	PFQA	81	73	45	117	44%	▲	
Enrollments (%)	PFQA	16%	28%	30%	29%	81%	▲	
Avg Weekly Hours of Engagement	FY11 Q3	1.6	1.0	1.6	1.2	-25%	▼	

Education	Baseline	Baseline					Δ	
		value	ERCPCP	PLC	Total			
Enrollments (#)	PFQA	130	53	34	86	-34%	—	
Enrollments (%)	PFQA	26%	20%	23%	21%	-19%	—	
Avg Weekly Hours of Engagement	FY11 Q3	2.3	1.7	1.9	1.8	-22%	▼	
Youth Achieving High School Credential	-	-	2	0	2	-	-	

Health	Baseline	Baseline					Δ	
		value	ERCPCP	PLC	Total			
Enrollments (#)	PFQA	90	61	32	91	1%	—	
Enrollments (%)	PFQA	18%	23%	22%	22%	24%	▲	
Avg Weekly Hours of Engagement	FY11 Q3	450%	350%	540%	420%	-7%	▼	

Community	Baseline	Baseline					Δ	
		value	ERCPCP	PLC	Total			
Enrollments (#)	PFQA	1	2	1	3	140%	▲	
Enrollments (%)	PFQA	0.2%	0.8%	0.7%	0.7%	198%	▲	
Avg Weekly Hours of Engagement	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

Creativity	Baseline	Baseline					Δ	
		value	ERCPCP	PLC	Total			
Enrollments (#)	PFQA	7	3	0	3	-59%	—	
Enrollments (%)	PFQA	1.4%	1.1%	0%	0.7%	-49%	▼	
Avg Weekly Hours of Engagement	FY11 Q3	6.3	7.6	-	7.6	21%	▲	

Fiscal Year 2011, Quarter 4

PFQA: Previous Four Quarters' Average

SALIENT TRENDS IN THE FY2011 4TH QUARTER DATA


This report is the second iteration of the agency’s quarterly reviews of DC YouthLink inputs, processes, outputs and outcomes. While a great deal of data is available for review in the Quarterly report’s Data Tables section, there are some trends that bear particular mention.

Overview of Youth Engagement

Demographics of Youth Served by DC YouthLink

In FY2011, 756 young people were served by DC YouthLink, with 496 being served by East of the River Clergy-Police Community Partnership (ERCPCP) and 291 served by Progressive Life Center (PLC). This represents a 27% increase from the number of youth serviced in FY2010.

Figure 1: Number of Youth Served by DC YouthLink



Focusing only on the most recent reporting period, FY2011 Q4, the two Lead Entities served a total 407 young people, down from 523 in the previous quarter. The agency attributes this decrease to an effort to hold community based residential facilities (CBRFs) accountable for providing full services for youth enrolled in their programs. While there are instances in

which it is appropriate for a youth enrolled at a CBRF to receive some additional support through DC YouthLink, the District’s general expectation is that CBRF providers will provide the necessary supports for DYRS young people.

In line with a recent trend in the overall DYRS population, the young people served by DC YouthLink have tended to be slightly older than the youth served in the initiative’s first year. In comparison to FY2010, when approximately 40% of youth were over 18, in FY2011, approximately 56% of the DC YouthLink population was 18 or older.

Services Received by Youth

Young people who completed their DC YouthLink enrollment in FY2011 Q4 received, on average, 4.0 services during their time in the community. This continues the strong trend toward increased levels of services each youth receives as the DC YouthLink initiative matures. As a point of comparison, youth exiting DC YouthLink in the 4th Quarter of FY2010 had received an average of 2.1 services each.

These services include those offered through the DC YouthLink network, through DYRS specific programs such as GPS monitoring, and through sister agencies such as Department of Mental Health or Department of Health’s Addiction

Figure 2: Average Services Received by DC YouthLink Discharged Youth FY2009-FY2011





Figure 3: Percent of Youth Receiving 3 or More Services during their Entire Enrollment with the Lead, by discharge Quarter



Services per Discharge Bin

- 0 Service Connections While in the Community
- 1 Service Connection While in the Community
- 2 Service Connections While in the Community
- 3+ Service Connections While in the Community

Prevention and Recovery Administration (APRA). Seven out of ten youth discharged in FY2011 Q4 had received at least three services while in their community placement.

Looking only at services provided through the Service Coalition, there was similar growth from FY2010 to FY2011, from 1.6 services per enrollment to 2.6 services.

While the number of overall services continues to grow, youth received slightly fewer services in the most recent review period (FY2011 Q4) than in the previous quarter. Between July and September, 2011, DC YouthLink youth were enrolled in an average of 2.2 services, down from 2.6 services in the third quarter.


There is a noted reduction in ERCPCP services from 2.8 to 2.1 during the fourth quarter and a smaller reduction for PLC, from 2.3 to 2.2. The reduction in services to youth enrolled with ERCPCP may be attributable to reducing hours

for tutoring when school was out of session (summer months).

Service Connections by Positive Youth Justice Outcome Domain

Ninety percent of youth connected to DC YouthLink in FY2011 received at least one service in the community. DC YouthLink’s Service Coalition members are achieving a greater level of connectivity with youth in the fourth quarter (84%), up from the fourth quarter of the previous year (79%) and FY2011 Q3 (76%). Since a youth is not “linked” until a positive face-to-face contact occurs, this speaks to Service Coalition members developing more

Figure 4: Percent of Youth Linked to Services in Each PYJ Outcome Domain




- Service Coalition - FY2011
- Service Coalition - FY11 Q4
- Other Providers - FY2011
- Other Providers - FY11 Q4

effective strategies to engage youth in service.¹

Seven out of ten youth enrolled in DC YouthLink were linked to a relationship-building service in FY2011. By and large these include mentors and family support services. This represents significant growth over the previous year, when 37% were enrolled with a relationship-focused service. In FY2011, another strong trend was a move away from having DC YouthLink provide Intensive Third Party Monitoring (ITPM). This has generally been replaced by Electronic Monitoring, which is provided directly by DYRS and is widely considered to be a more cost-efficient and

Figure 5: Change in the Percent of Youth Linked to Services, by PYJ Domain, FY2011 Q3 to Q4



¹ A review of the 38 youth in the fourth quarter of FY2011 who were not linked to any services during the quarter revealed that most of these youth were (1) receiving services that were not properly documented in their case file (24%); (2) within weeks of their commitment ending, and therefore transitioning out of services they had been receiving (24%); or (3) placed in a CBRF, and therefore receiving services through their placement provider (18%). For the remaining thirteen youth, there was either a delay in referring the youth to a provider, trouble with the young person committing to the services offered in the Quarter, or an assessment by the Case Manager that the youth was stable in his or her community placement and not in need of the services offered by DC YouthLink.

impactful public safety intervention. Generally, there were increases in enrollments in every service area, reflecting greater diversity in the numbers and types of services that DYRS youth access through DC YouthLink, and more success in connecting youth to these services.

Looking specifically at the fourth quarter data, there were significant increases in the percent of youth receiving relationship-building services and job training support. It is important that Quarter 4 of FY2011 corresponded with the District’s safe summer campaign and its commitment to ensure all youth were receiving services such as mentoring, job training and Electronic Monitoring to keep the youth engaged and safe. The use of educational support services decreased slightly, which aligns with school being out for the summer and a decreased need for tutoring services.

Average Weekly Engagement With Youth

There was a decrease in the average weekly contacts from FY2011 Q3 to Q4, from 3.1 contacts per week down to 2.1. On average, youth connected to DC YouthLink received 5.9 hours of service per week in the 4th quarter of FY2011, compared to 7.6 hours in June 2011, when the agency began tracking aggregate averages of youth contact.

Public Safety

Youth Killed or Charged with Murder

In the period of this review – the 4th Quarter of FY2011 – one young person enrolled with DC YouthLink was the victim of a homicide. The fiscal year closed with eight DC YouthLink youth having been victims of homicide – the same number as in FY2010.

No DC YouthLink youth were charged with committing a homicide in the final quarter of


FY2011. Two DC YouthLink youth were charged with murder in FY2011, which is lower than the five charged in FY2010. This represents a decrease from 0.8% to 0.3% of the DC YouthLink population.

Re-Arrests and Re-Petitions

DYRS began tracking re-arrests among DC YouthLink youth in April, 2011. In the two quarters reviewed, 68% of the youth enrolled with DC YouthLink, 395 youth total, had no new contact with the criminal justice system. In the 3rd Quarter of FY2011, 17% of enrolled youth were arrested during the quarter, while in Q4 24% had a new arrest. Because this is a new measure, the first four collection cycles, amounting to one full year of data, should be considered a baseline for evaluating DC YouthLink performance.

The charge type for which youth were most frequently re-petitioned was property crimes (9%), which include charges such as unauthorized use of vehicles and destruction of property. Five percent of DC YouthLink enrollees were re-arrested for a violent felony, including assault with a dangerous weapon and attempted robbery.

Figure 7: Re-Arrests by Title Charge, FY2011 Q3-Q4




Revocations

Fourteen young people in the 4th quarter had their community status revoked, meaning that they were removed from their community placement and placed in a more secure setting. This represented 3% of the youth enrolled, which is less than half the revocation rate from the final quarter of FY2010. Over the entire fiscal year, slightly less than one in ten youth enrolled in DC YouthLink had to be removed from their community placement for not abiding by the terms of their Community Placement Agreement, down from one in eight in FY2010.

Abscondence

IN FY2011, 30% of DC YouthLink youth absconded at some point from their DYRS-assigned placement. This is a slight reduction from the FY2010 abscondence rate of 31%. The percent of youth absconding during a particular quarter peaked in Q4 of FY2010 at 18%, then dropped to 12%, around where it has stayed since.

Figure 6: Abscondence Rates, Quarterly and One-Day Snapshots, FY2010-FY2011



While the number of youth absconding from their placement has remained steady, DYRS's ability to locate and apprehend youth on abscondence improved significantly between FY2010 and FY2011. This is reflected in the number of youth on abscondence on any given day. On the final day of the of the FY2011 Q4 reporting period, twelve DC YouthLink youth were on abscondence, or 3% of the youth served that quarter. The same day the year prior, 46 DC YouthLink youth had been on abscondence, representing 9% of enrollees. Through continued partnership with the Metropolitan Police Department and other sister agencies, DYRS hopes to continue its success in bring youth back in quickly after they abscond.

Relationships

Relationship-building services are the most broadly used interventions through DC YouthLink: two thirds of youth in the fourth quarter, and 70% of youth over FY2011 were linked to a relationship-building service. These services include mentoring, family support, youth parenting classes, and evidence-based interventions such as functional family therapy and multi-systemic therapy.

Mentoring makes up the preponderance of relationship-building services provided to DYRS youth through DC YouthLink, accounting for 91% of relationship-building service linkages in FY2011. This is slightly down from FY2010, when mentoring linkages made up 95% of the service linkages in this domain. The change is attributable to the maturity of the DCYL initiative and the availability of a wider array of services in FY2011 than existed in FY2010.

In the 4th Quarter, youth linked to mentoring received an average of 4 hours a week of face-to-face documented time with their mentor. On average, each session with the mentor lasted


about 3 hours, and occurred once or twice a week during the youth's enrollment.

Work

In FY2011, through the support of a U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) grant, DYRS was able to collaborate with DC YouthLink's Lead Entities to dramatically expand the job readiness programming for DYRS youth in the community. Over the course of FY2010, 63 youth, slightly over 10% of the overall DC YouthLink population, received work-readiness services. In FY2011, that number more than tripled, to 200 youth, or 26% of the youth receiving services from DC YouthLink, more than a two-fold increase from FY2010.

These interventions were targeted primarily at youth aged 18 and older. Thirty-five percent of these older youth were enrolled in a workforce development services in FY2011. By contrast, 17% of younger youth, who often still need to achieve a high school credential, received work readiness programming in the fiscal year.

Figure 8: Percent of DC YouthLink Connected to a Work - Readiness Program, FY2010-FY2011



While many of these youth received services provided directly through the Lead Entities and DYRS via the DOL grant, other Service Coalition members also contributed to preparing

DYRS youth for entering the job market. Most notably, Sasha Bruce Youthwork, LifeSkills Unlimited, and Image Works Consulting Firm each provided DYRS committed young people with workforce development services.

The DOL grant-related services began reporting service hours aggregately at the beginning of FY2012, and will be reported on in future reports. In Q4 of FY2011, other Service Coalition members provided youth in work readiness programs with an average of 3 hours and 45 minutes of face-to-face services each week. This rate of contact is slightly lower than the initial reporting period, June 2011, when young people were receiving on average 4 hours and 20 minutes each week.

The variance in contact hours between quarters may be a result of the larger sample-size afforded by the three months-worth of data analyzed in this reporting period, or it may reflect changes in the youth's environments, such as involvement in the Summer Youth Employment Program, which allowed the youth less time to work with the service provider. Understanding this sort of movement in average hours per week will require a larger baseline, established over several quarters.

Education

Education-related services for DC YouthLink youth also grew significantly between FY2010 and FY2011. Thirty-five percent (35%) of youth received some sort of educational assistance while in the community. These services ranged from helping youth get reintegrated in local schools (educational advocacy), to tutoring, to full time coursework (academic support). With the exception of specialty high school enrollments, these services are primarily intended to support youth who are enrolled in school. The growth in the portion of youth linked to education services in FY2011


amounted to a two-and-a-half-fold increase over the prior year.

From July through September, 2011, the current review period, there was an 8% decrease in the portion of youth receiving educational support services, falling from 29% in the third quarter to 21% in the fourth quarter. This overall decline in education-related engagement is fully attributable to a decrease in the use of tutoring, which is often suspended while a youth is on summer vacation.

The relationship between the school calendar and educational services provided through DC YouthLink is also evident in the distribution of older and younger youth in educational services. The educational services for older youth often focus on achievement of high school credentials, such as a GED, and generally occur independent of the traditional school year. For these young people, there was a slight fall off of educational services between Q3 and Q4 of FY2011, from 28% to 23% of youth receiving educational services. By contrast, younger youth, who generally attend regular high schools in the District, received significantly fewer services in the summer months, falling from 32% of youth in Q3 to 19% in Q4.

The decrease in youth receiving education-focused services in the current review period was mirrored in the hours of service that each

Figure 9: Average Weekly Hours of In-Person Education Services, by Service Type, FY2011 Q4




youth received. Youth enrolled in these sorts of services received, on average, 5 hours and 15 minutes of face-to-face services each week. This varied significantly across service types, however. Youth receiving support in getting re-engaged in their high school, through educational advocacy, only had an average of half an hour of contact with their service provider each week. Much of educational advocacy work is done independently of the young person. Conversely, youth who were enrolled with a more intensive academic provider, such as Children Having Opportunities in Changing Environments (CHOICE), received upwards of seven and a half hours of in-person service each week.

Health

The Health domain covers a broad array of services, from mental health to physical health. In DC YouthLink's first year, 11% of enrolled youth received some sort of health-related service. In FY2011, 25% of youth were linked to a health-related provider. Youth who received physical health services participated for an average of over 5 hours per week leading the trend in health service usage. The diversity of health-related interventions also grew. The number of youth documented to have received mental health services, for example, grew from 8 to 55. The number of youth linked to a substance abuse intervention grew from 20 to 50. The agency is working with local partners to expand both service offerings in the future.

Figure 10: Number of Youth Linked to Health-Focused Services, FY 2010-FY2011



Community & Creativity

The final two Positive Youth Justice domains, Community and Creativity, have lagged behind the other domains in terms of service linkages through DC YouthLink. In the 4th Quarter, three youth were linked to a community-focused service, and another three in creativity-focused services. Although only three youth were connected to the arts this quarter, the time spent engaged was very significant. Youth engaged in creative arts spent an average of nearly 9 hours per week in this activity. This type of engagement speaks to the importance of connecting youth with services that they 'connect' with deeply. Since its inception, fewer than 2% of youth have been linked to services in either domain. This continues to be an area for improvement.

ABOUT THE DC YOUTHLINK INITIATIVE



DC YouthLink is a non-profit coalition of organizations that has partnered with DYRS to successfully reintegrate juvenile offenders into their communities by providing a host of services and supports to the youth and their families. DC YouthLink is working with local and national partners to improve the community reentry process so that the needs of DYRS youth, the family and the communities to which they return are being met.

Offering a continuum of community services and support to incarcerated youth in reentry is an integral part of the juvenile justice system. There is a vast array of services in youth's home communities to support them. Historically, however, there was no convenient way to find out about the full range of these services and providers.

To bridge this gap, DYRS partnered with two community based organizations, the East of the River Clergy-Police Community Partnership and the Progressive Life Center, to provide community-based services for DYRS youth. These organizations, referred to as the 'Lead Entities,' provide coordination and oversight of community-based services through a network of local providers, known as their Regional Service Coalitions. The Lead Entities function as care coordinating entities, funders and monitors of the providers in their Regional Service Coalitions, and as engagement vehicles for increasing and diversifying community-based services for DYRS youth.

The referral process for linking youth to services is as follows. When a youth in DYRS's custody is preparing for community-based placement in the District of Columbia, a Youth Family Team Meeting (YFTM) is held. In that meeting, the youth, members of his or her family, the DYRS Case Manager, other concerned adults, and a representative from one of the Lead Entities discuss the youth's individual strengths and needs. Based on this discussion, the group agrees upon a particular combination of services that will offer the youth the best opportunity for success in the community. Once a core set of desired service linkages is articulated, the Lead Entity representative provides information on the various service providers available. The group then agrees on specific referrals for services, which the Lead Entity is then expected to fill soon after the meeting's close. There are no established quotas for referrals to specific service types, meaning that service referral rates are generally demand driven, based on the individualized youth needs as articulated in YFTM discussions.

Prior to the establishment of the Lead Entity initiative, DYRS contracted directly with community-based organizations. DYRS had one predominant service that it provided to youth in the community: Intensive Third Party Monitoring (ITPM). This service was provided by a handful of vendors, each with individual contacts directly with DYRS. Today, rather than just rely on ITPM, DYRS Case Managers, youth, and their families select from the Lead Entities' range of services that are customized to the youth's skills, interests, and needs.

THE OVERSIGHT PROCESS

In an effort to improve performance and promote accountability, DYRS monitors the services provided to the agency's young people through the DC YouthLink initiative. The results of DYRS' research regarding community-based service provision are reported quarterly in this report. The report focuses heavily on the types of services DYRS youth receive and the frequency with which they receive them. These are the basic building-blocks of rehabilitation and successful reintegration into the District's communities. As possible, the agency also reports on the outcomes of these services, both positive and negative. This includes outcomes such as youth graduating from high school, getting a job, or having new contacts with the justice system.

The Role of Standardized and Data-Driven Oversight

DC YouthLink plays an important role within the DYRS continuum of services by providing support services to youth that meet their unique needs as they transition back into their communities and into adulthood. The Quarterly Performance Report allows for a regularized snapshot of the breadth and depth of services that DYRS youth receive through DC YouthLink and other agency initiatives.

The report, though reporting on outcomes, should not be considered final evaluations of the initiative. Instead, the quarterly reviews are waypoints that mark progress toward the goal of comprehensive service provision and effective rehabilitation. The reports provide opportunities for course correction at regular intervals.

Overview of the Report's Framework and Methodology

The Positive Youth Justice & Public Safety Framework

In designing its oversight plan for the Lead Entity initiative, DYRS drew heavily from the evidence-based Positive Youth Justice framework developed by researchers led by Jeffery Butts, Executive Director of the Criminal Justice Research and Evaluation Center at John Jay College of Criminal Justice in New York City. The framework builds on the substantial body of evidence supporting Positive Youth Development (PYD) as a general strategy for helping young people transition to a positive adulthood. Most PYD research, though, focuses on youth outside of the juvenile justice system. Dr. Butts and his colleagues, in their research surrounding Positive Youth Justice, tailor what we know about PYD to the specific needs of court-involved youth. Their research, presented in the paper, "Positive Youth Justice: Framing Justice Interventions Using the Concepts of Positive Youth Development,"² recommends six domains for engaging court-involved youth:

- Relationships
- Education
- Work
- Health
- Creativity
- Community

To this list, DYRS has added a seventh domain, "Public Safety." Together, these seven areas inform the agency's oversight of the Leads, and it is across these domains that DYRS plans to evaluate the efficacy of the Lead Entity initiative.

² Butts, Jeffrey A., Gordon Bazemore, & Aundra Saa Meroe (2010). Positive Youth Justice--Framing Justice Interventions Using the Concepts of Positive Youth Development. Washington, DC: Coalition for Juvenile Justice. © 2010

Definitions

An **enrollment** refers to a youth's assignment to one of DC YouthLink's two Lead Entities. A Lead Entities' number of enrollments is separate from its number of **unique youth**, as it is possible for a single youth to have multiple enrollments with one or both Lead Entities.³

Community placements include including home placement, independent living, group homes, therapeutic group homes, foster care homes and shelters in the DC Metropolitan area.

A **service linkage** refers to a youth's enrollment with a specific community provider. A linkage differs from a referral in that a linkage is made only after the youth has had at least one successful face-to-face contact with an organization. An **activity** refers to a face-to-face contact with a youth by a service provider.

The **Service Coalition** are community-based organizations that have a contractual relationship with the one or both of the Lead Entities. Members of the Service Coalition are denoted with a plus sign (+) in the margin next to their name. DYRS youth also have access to services provided by other and organizations, such as Core Service Agencies that contract with the Department of Mental Health. These service

³ Youth are generally referred to a Lead Entity prior to their arrival in a community-based placement so that the Lead can identify service providers in anticipation of the youth's arrival. However, for the purposes of this report, which looks primarily at the number and rate of service activities a youth has while in the community, an enrollment is considered to begin only when the youth is living in a community placement. An enrollment is considered terminated if one of the following occurs: (1) the youth has his assignment to the Lead Entity formally ended; (2) the youth is removed from the community placement for 30 days or more; or (3) the youth is on abscondence status for 30 days or more.

linkages are reported in the Quarterly Report as well, but have no plus sign.

A **re-arrest** includes any new adult or juvenile arrest that occurred at some point during the quarter while the youth was enrolled with DC YouthLink, or following an abscondence that resulted in the termination of a DC YouthLink enrollment. A **re-petition** occurs when a prosecuting body, such as the Office of the Attorney General or the U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia, formally charges the youth with an offense. The **top charge** for an arrest is the most serious crime cited in the police report.

A youth is **revoked** from a community placement when he or she is removed from a community-based placement and placed in a residential treatment center or other secure facility for at least 30 days.

An **abscondence** occurs when a youth is not where he or she is supposed to be according to the provisions in his or her Community Release Agreement. Abscondences can include missed curfews and the failure to attend school or a required appointment.

Data collection methods

The data used to populate the report are drawn from the agency's youth database. When youth are linked to a community-based service provider, it is noted in his or her file. Subsequently, following each activity that the provider completes with the youth, the Service Coalition members are required to record that they were with the youth, document specific start and end times for the activity, and provide a description of how that time was spent.⁴ Both

⁴ The process of training Service Coalition members to accurately record activities in the DYRS database, and the process of refining appropriate processes and codings, meant that tracking of individual

the Lead Entities and DYRS regularly check these records to ensure that the information they hold is reliable. Service Coalition Members are also instructed to bookmark youth milestones, such as attaining a high-school credential or starting a job, in the youth's file.

At the close of each quarter, DYRS extracts all the information from each youth's record in order to perform an aggregate analysis of the services received by committed youth and the milestones each youth has achieved.

The data is first 'scrubbed' to identify and correct data entry errors and, as necessary, account for time lags between enrollment with a Lead Entity and arrival in a community-based placement. For analysis of DC YouthLink programming specific to a particular quarter or fiscal year, the data is further honed to include only those youth who were enrolled with a Lead Entity and present in the community for at least seven days during the reporting period. This narrowing of the data set is conducted because the rate of service provision is often only one youth contact per week. For youth who were linked with a service provider for less than one week during a particular reporting period, there may not have been sufficient opportunity to engage with the young person.

Once the complete set of data is established, an analyst in DYRS's Office of Research and Quality Assurance conducts aggregate level analysis of each youth's service linkages and rate of activities. The results of this analysis

activities within the DYRS database was not fully launched until this past Quarter.⁴ In May 2011 DYRS launched a pilot for tracking activities in the database. Then, after the pilot ended successfully, on June 1, 2011 all Service Coalition members were expected to begin tracking their youth contacts in the DYRS system. For this reason, FY2011 activity reporting did not begin until June 1, 2011

constitute the bulk of the Quarterly Performance Report's data.

Data Collection and Analysis Challenges

Data collection for an initiative as large as DC YouthLink presents many challenges. Service Coalition members are diverse in the types of interventions they provided for DYRS youth, as well as in their technical capacity for documenting the work they do. In order to maximize data reliability, each member of DC YouthLink has been trained in appropriate data entry through the DYRS data system. DYRS also conducts random audits of youths' electronic files to further verify that Service Coalition members are accurately and appropriately documenting their activities. Even with these safeguards, however, there is room for data entry error.

In working with the provider community to document their activities in a uniform manner, DYRS prioritized the documentation of youth contacts. Individual contacts were prioritized because this information allows the agency to (1) quickly identify youth who have not been in regular contact with a DC YouthLink provider, (2) hold Service Coalition members accountable for the level of engagement they achieve with youth they are assigned, and (3) verify the hours of engagement reported by Service Coalition members through the budgeting and payment process. With all members appropriately documenting their contacts with DYRS youth, the agency has moved on to prioritize the documentation of youth's "milestones," such as earning a high school diploma or starting a new job. The milestones were introduced during the fourth quarter of FY2011. Reporting of these sorts of achievements prior to FY2012 was not uniform or centralized, and therefore was likely to be under-counted. The agency believes, however, that the appropriate reporting

structures are in place for FY2012 to accurately capture these important events.

Another challenge in data collection is the frequency with which some youth may enter or exit their community placement. Some young people who are living in a community-based placement may be temporarily removed from the community (less than seven days) as a result of court proceedings, or out of concern for the safety of the young person or the community. Analysts in DYRS' Office of Research and Quality Assurance have reviewed many of the files of DC YouthLink youth in order to identify or verify these types of interruptions in a youth's community stay. Nevertheless, it is possible that these sorts of short out-of-placement stays, when not fully captured, could affect the aggregates data at the margins.

Finally, there are times when young people's support services are not fully documented in

their files. This is a result of data entry error, and occurs most frequently when young people receive services through Core Service Agencies, as a result of historical data entry practices.

DYRS believes the information presented in this report is accurate, but recognizes the possibility that human error could inadvertently generate some inaccuracies in reported data. Indeed, one such error has been identified in the FY2011 Q3 Quarterly Performance Report. A bug in the computer-generated data reports excluded youth who had received services from DC YouthLink in the 3rd Quarter, but whose commitment ended prior to the date of the initial data pull in early July, 2011. This primarily resulted in an under-reporting of the youth served by DC YouthLink during that quarter. The amended numbers are reflected in the FY2011 Q4 Quarterly Performance Report, and the computer glitch has been fixed.

INTERPRETING THE DATA TABLES IN THE REPORT

The tables included in the Quarterly Performance Report are data-rich to allow the reader to identify relevant trends and points of comparison. For each measure, the tables provide three types of information:

- Quarter Comparison
- Fiscal Year Comparison
- Overall Summary Data

The quarterly comparison provides the data from the most recent reporting period as it compares to the previous quarter as well as the same quarter the previous year.

	Quarter Comparison					
	Q4		Prev. Qtr		This Qtr Last Yr	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
DC Youth Link						
Male	355	87%	453	87%	463	90%
Female	52	13%	70	13%	49	10%

Unless otherwise indicated, the numbers beneath the heading “#” represent the count of unique youth. The “%” represents the percent of unique youth enrolled in DC YouthLink during the reporting period. For example, the 355 males indicated in the table above represent 87% of the 407 total unique youth served by DC YouthLink the fourth quarter.

	Fiscal Year Comparison			
	FY 2011		FY 2010	
	#	%	#	%
DC Youth Link				
Male	668	88%	538	91%
Female	88	12%	56	9%

Fiscal Year comparisons for each measure compare the current fiscal year’s to-date data as

compared to the year-to-date data from the previous year.

Finally, the Summary section provides aggregated data over the entire length of data collection. Using the example above, during the fourth quarter of 2011, 355 males were enrolled with DC YouthLink, representing 87% of the population. During the entirety of FY2011, 603 unique males have been enrolled. Since the beginning of FY2010, 817 males have received DC YouthLink services, representing 89% of the initiative’s served population.

In the eight fiscal quarters that DYRS has been

	Summary Data FY10 - Present				
	Total	%	Min	Max	Sparkline
DC Youth Link					
Male	817	89%	87%	97%	
Female	103	11%	3%	13%	

collecting data on DC YouthLink enrollments, the males have represented, at maximum, 97% of the youth served, and at their lowest, 87%. This is indicated in the “Min” and “Max” column.

The Sparkline column provides a micro-graph that gives the reader a visual indication of the overall trend for a particular measure in quarterly intervals. For enrollment data, the sparklines begin in the first quarter of FY2010 and document each quarter’s value up to the present. The sparkline is annotated with a green dot, indicating the quarter with the maximum value, and a red dot indicating the quarter, or quarters, with the minimum value.

Because they are meant to show directional trends, the sparklines have independent axes, meaning that they are each on their own scale. For example, the gender sparklines in the examples above, with the male sparkline sloping downward and the female sparkline sloping

upward, indicate that the general trend for FY2010-FY2011 was that females increasingly represented a larger proportion of the population over time. Despite the females' sparkline ending visually higher than the males' sparkline, females nevertheless continue to represent a significant minority of the DC YouthLink youth served.

The tables reporting on youth engagement through DC YouthLink activities are structured in a similar manner to the enrollment tables, with slight adjustments. Here, the focus is on the number of hours of engagement a youth received during the reporting period. Hours per week is calculated by multiplying the average contacts that a service provider has with a youth each week by the average length of each contact:

$$\text{hours per week} = (\text{activities per week}) \times (\text{hours per activity})$$

In these tables, all three data points are provided. An important note is that the hours and activity counts documented in these tables refer only to youth linked to the indicated service. While the overall DC YouthLink hours per week calculation reports the average numbers of overall engagement for all DC YouthLink youth, the hours reported within a particular domain are calculated only for youth linked to a service within that domain.

	Quarter Comparison					
	Hours per Week		Activities per Week		Hours per Contact	
	Q4	Q3*	Q4	Q3*	Q4	Q3*
DC Youth Link	5.9	7.6	2.1	3.1	2.8	2.5

INDEX OF TABLES

I. Youth Engagement

A. Demographics of Youth Serviced by the Leads

1. *Number of youth enrolled with DC YouthLink*
2. *Sex*
3. *Race*
4. *Age*

B. Services per Enrollment

1. *Average services per enrollment – overall*
2. *Average services per enrollment – Service Coalition*
3. *Average services during the reporting period – overall*
4. *Average services during the reporting period – Service Coalition*

C. Service Connections by Positive Youth Justice Outcome Domain

1. *Count of Youth Connected to Services by Positive Youth Justice Outcome Domain – overall*
2. *Count of Youth Connected to Services by Positive Youth Justice Outcome Domain – Service Coalition*

D. Average Weekly Contacts

1. *Average weekly hours of contact per youth*
2. *Average weekly hours of contact per youth by PYJ Domain*

II. Public Safety

A. Youth Killed or Charged with Murder

1. *Youth killed*
2. *Youth charged with murder*

B. Re-Arrests and Re-Petitions

1. *Youth re-arrested*
2. *Youth re-arrested, by top charge*
3. *Youth re-petitioned*
4. *Youth re-petitioned, by top charge*

C. Revocation

1. *Youth removed from community placements*

D. Abscondence

1. *Youth who absconded while enrolled in DC YouthLink*
2. *Abscondence one-day snapshot*

E. Linkage to Public Safety-Focused Services

1. *Linkage to a Public Safety-focused service*

III. Relationships

A. Linkage to a relationship-building service

1. *Youth linked to a relationship-building service, by type*
2. *Youth linked to a relationship-building service, by provider*

B. Engagement with relationship-building activities

1. *Average weekly hours of contact per youth*
2. *Average weekly hours of contact per youth, by provider*

IV. Work

A. Linkage to a work readiness program

1. *Youth linked to a work readiness program, by type*
2. *Youth linked to a work readiness program, by provider*
3. *Youth linked to a work readiness program, by age*

B. Engagement with work readiness activities

1. *Average weekly hours of contact per youth*
2. *Average weekly hours of contact per youth, by provider*

V. Education

A. Educational Outcomes

1. *Youth achieving a high school credential*

B. Linkage to an educational support service

1. *Youth linked to an educational support service, by type*
2. *Youth linked to an educational support service, by provider*
3. *Youth linked to an educational support service, by age*

C. Engagement with educational support activities

1. *Average weekly hours of contact per youth*
2. *Average weekly hours of contact per youth, by provider*

VI. Health

A. Linkage to a health-focused service

1. *Youth linked to a health-focused service, by type*
2. *Youth linked to a health-focused service, by provider*
3. *Youth linked to a health-focused service, by age*

B. Engagement with health-focused activities

1. *Average weekly hours of contact per youth*
2. *Average weekly hours of contact per youth, by provider*

VII. Community

A. Linkage to a community participation service

1. *Youth linked to a community participation service, by type*
2. *Youth linked to a community participation service, by provider*
3. *Youth linked to a community participation service, by age*

B. Engagement with community participation activities

1. *Average weekly hours of contact per youth*

VIII. Creativity

A. Linkage to a creative expression service

1. *Youth linked to a creative expression service, by type*
2. *Youth linked to a creative expression service, by provider*
3. *Youth linked to a creative expression service, by age*

B. Engagement with creative expression activities

1. *Average weekly hours of contact per youth*
2. *Average weekly hours of contact per youth, by provider*

Data Tables

I.A Demographics of Youth Served by DC YouthLink

1. Number of youth enrolled with DC Youth Link

Count of unique youth. Includes all Lead-connected youth in community-based placements in the DC Metropolitan area. For quarterly measures, excludes youth who were on abscondence status for the entire duration of their Lead enrollment during the reporting period, and youth enrolled with the Lead for less than 1 week during the reporting period.

	Quarter Comparison			Fiscal Year Comparison		Summary Data FY10 - Present				
	Q4	Prev. Qtr	This Qtr Last Yr	FY 2011	FY 2010	Total	Avg	Min	Max	Sparkline
DC Youth Link	407	523	512	756	594	920	400	75	525	
ERCPCP	264	348	325	496	390	617	262	47	348	
Progressive Life Center	149	178	190	291	222	356	143	28	191	

2. Sex

	Quarter Comparison						Fiscal Year Comparison				Summary Data FY10 - Present				
	Q4		Prev. Qtr		This Qtr Last Yr		FY 2011		FY 2010		Total	%	Min	Max	Sparkline
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%					
DC Youth Link															
Male	355	87%	453	87%	463	90%	668	88%	538	91%	817	89%	87%	97%	
Female	52	13%	70	13%	49	10%	88	12%	56	9%	103	11%	3%	13%	
ERCPCP															
Male	229	87%	298	86%	292	90%	434	88%	351	90%	542	88%	86%	98%	
Female	35	13%	50	14%	33	10%	62	13%	39	10%	75	12%	2%	14%	
Progressive Life															
Male	132	89%	156	88%	172	91%	258	89%	201	91%	317	89%	85%	96%	
Female	17	11%	22	12%	18	9%	33	11%	21	9%	39	11%	4%	15%	

3. Race

	Quarter Comparison						Fiscal Year Comparison				Summary Data FY10 - Present				
	Q4		Prev. Qtr		This Qtr Last Yr		FY 2011		FY 2010		Total	%	Min	Max	Sparkline
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%					
DC Youth Link															
Black	390	96%	501	96%	491	96%	725	96%	572	96%	885	96%	96%	100%	
Latino	16	4%	21	4%	20	4%	30	4%	21	4%	34	3.7%	0%	4.0%	
White	1	0%	1	0%	1	0%	1	0%	1	0%	1	0.1%	0%	0.2%	
ERCPCP															
Black	258	98%	339	97%	320	98%	485	98%	384	98%	605	98%	97%	100%	
Latino	6	2%	9	3%	5	2%	11	2%	6	2%	12	1.9%	0%	2.9%	
White	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0%	0%	
Progressive Life															
Black	138	93%	165	93%	173	91%	270	93%	205	92%	331	93%	91%	100%	
Latino	10	7%	12	7%	16	8%	20	7%	16	7%	24	6.7%	0%	8.4%	
White	1	1%	0	0%	1	1%	1	0%	1	0%	1	0.3%	0%	0.7%	

4. Age*

	Quarter Comparison						Fiscal Year Comparison				Summary Data FY10 - Present		
	Q4		FY11 Q3		FY10 Q4		FY11		FY10		Min	Max	Sparkline
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%			
DC Youth Link													
Under 18	155	38%	179	34%	257	50%	329	44%	347	58%	34%	55%	
Over 18	252	62%	344	66%	255	50%	427	56%	236	40%	45%	76%	
ERCPCP													
Under 18	101	38%	123	35%	164	50%	218	44%	223	57%	35%	55%	
Over 18	163	62%	225	65%	161	50%	278	56%	157	40%	45%	72%	
Progressive Life													
Under 18	55	37%	56	31%	95	50%	123	42%	129	58%	31%	54%	
Over 18	94	63%	122	69%	95	50%	168	58%	91	41%	46%	82%	

*Age calculated on the final day of the reporting period for quarterly indicators, and at the mid-year point for annual measures

I.B Services per Enrollment

1. Average services per enrollment - overall

Count of unique services provided to each youth during the entirety of his/her Lead Entity enrollment. Calculated by taking the sum of unique services divided by the number of unique enrollments. The data is constrained to youth discharged during the reporting period. Includes services provided by Service Coalition members and other partners.

	Quarter Comparison			Fiscal Year Comparison		Summary Data FY10 - Present			
	Q4	Prev. Qtr	This Qtr Last Yr	FY 2011	FY 2010	Avg	Min	Max	Sparkline
DC Youth Link	4.0	3.4	2.1	3.3	1.8	3.0	1.0	4.0	
ERCPCP	4.3	3.3	2.2	3.4	1.9	3.0	1.5	4.3	
Progressive Life Center	3.4	3.5	1.9	3.1	1.7	2.8	1.0	3.5	

2. Average services per enrollment - Service Coalition

Includes only services provided by Service Coalition members.

	Current Reporting Period (FY11-Q4)			Fiscal Year Comparison		Summary Data FY10 - Present			
	Q4	Prev. Qtr	This Qtr Last Yr	FY 2011	FY 2010	Avg	Min	Max	Sparkline
DC Youth Link	3.1	2.6	1.8	2.6	1.6	2.3	1.0	3.1	
ERCPCP	3.3	2.5	1.7	2.6	1.5	2.3	1.0	3.3	
Progressive Life Center	2.5	2.8	1.9	2.4	1.6	2.2	1.0	2.8	

3. Average services during the reporting period - overall

Count of unique services provided to each youth during a single reporting period. Includes services provided by both Service Coalition members and other partners.

	Current Reporting Period (FY11-Q4)			Fiscal Year Comparison		Summary Data FY10 - Present			
	Q4	Prev. Qtr	This Qtr Last Yr	FY 2011	FY 2010	Avg	Min	Max	Sparkline
DC Youth Link	2.2	2.6	1.8	3.0	2.1	3.0	1.0	2.6	
ERCPCP	2.1	2.8	1.8	3.1	2.1	3.0	1.1	2.8	
Progressive Life Center	2.2	2.3	1.7	2.8	2.3	2.9	1.0	2.6	

4. Average services during the reporting period - Service Coalition

Count of unique services provided to each youth during a single reporting period. Includes only services provided by Service Coalition members.

	Current Reporting Period (FY11-Q4)			Fiscal Year Comparison		Summary Data FY10 - Present			
	Q4	Prev. Qtr	This Qtr Last Yr	FY 2011	FY 2010	Avg	Min	Max	Sparkline
DC Youth Link	1.7	2.0	1.7	2.5	1.8	2.5	1.1	2.0	
ERCPCP	1.6	2.2	1.6	2.6	1.7	2.6	1.1	2.2	
Progressive Life Center	1.8	1.8	1.8	2.3	1.9	2.4	1.1	1.8	

I.C Service Connections by Positive Youth Justice Outcome Domain

I. Count of Youth Connected to Services by Positive Youth Justice Outcome Domain - Overall

Count of unique youth linked to services within each Positive Youth Justice Domain. Includes community-based services from both Service Coalition members and other partners.

	Quarter Comparison						Fiscal Year Comparison				Summary Data FY10 - Present				
	Q4		Prev. Qtr		This Qtr Last Yr		FY 2011		FY 2010		Total	%	Min	Max	Sparkline
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%					
DC Youth Link															
Relationships	271	67%	300	57%	191	37%	517	68%	221	37%	596	65%	7%	70%	
Public Safety	180	44%	231	44%	325	63%	541	72%	420	71%	691	75%	44%	91%	
Work	117	29%	126	24%	59	12%	200	26%	67	11%	221	24%	0%	29%	
Education	102	25%	153	29%	83	16%	265	35%	93	16%	301	33%	0%	35%	
Health	91	22%	116	22%	67	13%	190	25%	79	13%	220	24%	0%	25%	
Creativity	3	1%	5	1%	8	2%	12	2%	10	2%	17	2%	0%	2%	
Community	3	1%	1	0%	2	0%	3	0%	2	0%	4	0%	0%	1%	
DCYL Youth Linkages	369	91%	420	80%	421	82%	684	90%	514	87%	920	100%	80%	100%	
ERCPCP															
Relationships	185	70%	221	64%	109	34%	357	72%	125	32%	403	65%	4%	73%	
Public Safety	111	42%	156	45%	197	61%	351	71%	259	66%	446	72%	33%	91%	
Work	73	28%	78	22%	32	10%	115	23%	39	10%	129	21%	0%	28%	
Education	53	20%	120	34%	41	13%	173	35%	47	12%	191	31%	0%	34%	
Health	61	23%	95	27%	50	15%	136	27%	59	15%	158	26%	0%	31%	
Creativity	3	1%	5	1%	8	2%	12	2%	10	3%	17	3%	0%	3%	
Community	2	1%	0	0%	1	0%	2	0%	1	0%	3	0%	0%	1%	
ERCPCP Youth Linkages	247	94%	294	84%	258	79%	458	92%	322	83%	617	100%	45%	100%	
Progressive Life Center															
Relationships	88	59%	82	46%	82	43%	173	59%	98	44%	211	59%	11%	62%	
Public Safety	69	46%	75	42%	129	68%	200	69%	171	77%	268	75%	42%	89%	
Work	45	30%	48	27%	28	15%	88	30%	28	13%	95	27%	0%	30%	
Education	34	23%	33	19%	42	22%	94	32%	47	21%	114	32%	0%	34%	
Health	32	21%	18	10%	17	9%	57	20%	20	9%	65	18%	0%	21%	
Creativity	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0%	0%	
Community	1	1%	1	1%	1	1%	1	0%	1	0%	1	0%	0%	1%	
PLC Youth Linkages	126	85%	129	72%	165	87%	252	87%	205	92%	356	100%	54%	100%	

2. Count of Youth Connected to Services by Positive Youth Justice Outcome Domain - Service Coalition

Count of unique youth linked to services within each Positive youth Justice Domain. Includes only community-based services from Service Coalition members.

	Quarter Comparison						Fiscal Year Comparison				Summary Data FY10 - Present				
	Q4		Prev. Qtr		This Qtr Last Yr		FY 2011		FY 2010		Total	%	Min	Max	Sparkline
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%					
DC Youth Link															
Relationships	267	66%	307	59%	161	31%	506	67%	182	31%	564	61%	7%	71%	
Public Safety	14	3%	55	11%	324	63%	302	40%	414	70%	495	54%	3%	91%	
Work	100	25%	116	22%	33	6%	169	22%	33	6%	178	19%	0%	25%	
Education	78	19%	150	29%	59	12%	265	35%	59	10%	258	28%	0%	29%	
Health	72	18%	92	18%	33	6%	152	20%	42	7%	169	18%	0%	20%	
Creativity	3	1%	5	1%	8	2%	12	2%	10	2%	17	2%	0%	2%	
Community	2	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	0%	0	0%	2	0%	0%	0%	
DCYL Youth Linkages	343	84%	397	76%	404	79%	650	86%	494	83%	810	88%	76%	92%	
ERCPCP															
Relationships	184	70%	226	65%	78	24%	348	70%	86	22%	373	60%	4%	75%	
Public Safety	7	3%	27	8%	198	61%	183	37%	256	66%	310	50%	3%	91%	
Work	63	24%	71	20%	14	4%	95	19%	14	4%	99	16%	0%	24%	
Education	50	19%	120	34%	45	14%	171	34%	45	12%	187	30%	0%	34%	
Health	43	16%	73	21%	32	10%	108	22%	40	10%	124	20%	0%	24%	
Creativity	3	1%	5	1%	8	2%	12	2%	10	3%	17	3%	0%	3%	
Community	2	1%	0	0%	0	0%	2	0%	0	0%	2	0%	0%	1%	
ERCPCP Youth Linkages	232	88%	279	80%	249	77%	436	88%	309	79%	537	87%	4%	95%	
Progressive Life Center															
Relationships	85	57%	83	47%	84	44%	170	58%	98	44%	208	58%	11%	64%	
Public Safety	7	5%	28	16%	127	67%	124	43%	168	76%	200	56%	5%	89%	
Work	38	26%	46	26%	19	10%	77	26%	19	9%	82	23%	0%	26%	
Education	29	19%	30	17%	14	7%	63	22%	14	6%	74	21%	0%	19%	
Health	29	19%	19	11%	1	1%	45	15%	2	1%	46	13%	0%	19%	
Creativity	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0%	0%	
Community	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0%	0%	
PLC Youth Linkages	114	77%	121	68%	158	83%	234	80%	197	89%	311	87%	68%	90%	

I.D Average Weekly Contacts

1. Average weekly hours of contact per youth

	Quarter Comparison					
	Hours per Week		Activities per Week		Hours per Activity	
	Q4	Q3*	Q4	Q3*	Q4	Q3*
DC Youth Link	5.9	7.6	2.1	3.1	2.8	2.5
ERCPCP	5.1	7.5	1.9	2.9	2.7	2.5
Progressive Life	7.3	8.2	2.5	3.5	2.9	2.3

Fiscal Year Comparison

Hours per Week	
FY11*	FY10
6.0	-
5.5	-
6.9	-

Summary Data

Hours per Week		
Min	Max	Sparkline
5.9	7.6	
5.1	7.5	
7.3	8.2	

*Activity hours not reported for aggregation prior to June 1, 2011. All Q3 and FY11 data is calculated from June 1 through the end of the reporting period.

2. Average Hours of Contact per week by PYJ Domain

	Quarter Comparison					
	Hours per Week		Activities per Week		Hours per Activity	
	Q4	Q3*	Q4	Q3*	Q4	Q3*
DC Youth Link						
Relationships	4.4	5.4	1.5	1.9	2.9	2.8
Work	3.8	4.1	1.2	1.5	3.2	2.7
Education	5.8	7.0	1.9	2.5	3.0	2.8
Health	4.3	4.9	1.5	1.8	2.8	2.7
Creativity	7.6	6.3	2.4	1.2	3.2	5.4
Community	-	-	-	-	-	-
DCYL Avg Hours of Contact	5.9	7.8	2.0	2.8	2.9	2.8
ERCPCP						
Relationships	4.1	5.2	1.5	1.1	2.7	2.7
Work	2.6	3.6	0.9	1.5	3.0	2.5
Education	5.4	7.2	1.8	4.0	3.0	2.8
Health	3.6	4.0	1.3	1.9	2.8	2.6
Creativity	7.6	6.3	2.4	0.5	3.2	5.4
Community	-	-	-	-	-	-
ERCPCP Avg Hours of Contact	5.1	7.6	1.8	2.3	2.8	2.7

Fiscal Year Comparison

Hours per Week	
FY11*	FY10
4.1	-
3.6	-
5.5	-
4.1	-
6.7	-
-	-
6.0	-
3.8	-
2.6	-
5.4	-
3.7	-
6.7	-
-	-
5.6	-

Summary Data

Hours per Week		
Min	Max	Sparkline
1.5	5.4	
1.2	4.1	
1.9	7.0	
1.5	4.9	
1.2	7.6	
0.0	0.0	
2.0	7.8	
4.1	5.2	
2.6	3.6	
5.4	7.2	
3.6	4.0	
6.3	7.6	
0.0	0.0	
5.1	7.6	

2. Average Hours of Contact per Week (cont'd)

	Quarter Comparison					
	Hours per Week		Activities per Week		Hours per Activity	
	Q4	Q3*	Q4	Q3*	Q4	Q3*
Progressive Life						
Relationships	4.9	6.3	1.5	1.0	3.2	2.9
Work	5.1	8.4	1.5	3.5	3.3	3.4
Education	6.2	7.4	2.0	2.0	3.1	2.9
Health	5.7	7.2	2.0	1.1	2.8	2.9
Creativity	-	-	-	-	-	-
Community	-	-	-	-	-	-
PLC Avg Hours of Contact	7.3	8.4	2.3	1.5	3.1	2.9

Fiscal Year Comparison

Hours per Week	
FY11*	FY10
4.7	-
5.4	-
5.8	-
5.2	-
-	-
-	-
6.9	-

Summary Data

Hours per Week		
Min	Max	Sparkline
4.9	6.3	
5.1	8.4	
6.2	7.4	
5.7	7.2	
-	-	
-	-	
7.3	8.4	

*Activity hours not reported for aggregation prior to June 1, 2011. All Q3 and FY11 data is calculated from June 1 through the end of the reporting period.

II. Public Safety

II.A Youth Killed or Charged with Murder

1. Youth killed

Count of youth who are killed while enrolled with the Lead Entity

	Quarter Comparison						Fiscal Year Comparison				Summary Data FY10 - Present				
	Q4		Prev. Qtr		This Qtr Last Yr		FY 2011		FY 2010		Total	%	Min	Max	Sparkline
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%					
DCYL youth killed	1	0.2%	2	0.4%	3	0.6%	8	1.1%	8	1.3%	16	1.7%	0.2%	1.3%	
ERCPCP	0	0.0%	1	0.3%	1	0.3%	4	0.8%	4	1.0%	8	1.3%	0.0%	0.7%	
Progressive Life Center	1	0.7%	1	0.6%	2	1.1%	4	1.4%	4	1.8%	8	2.2%	0.0%	3.6%	
<i>Non-DC Youth Link youth</i>	0	-	1	-	2	-	1	-	3	-	4	-	-	-	

1. Youth charged with murder

Count of youth who are charged with a murder that occurred during the reporting period and while the youth was enrolled with the Lead Entity

	Quarter Comparison						Fiscal Year Comparison				Summary Data FY10 - Present				
	Q4		Prev. Qtr		This Qtr Last Yr		FY 2011		FY 2010		Total	%	Min	Max	Sparkline
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%					
DCYL youth charged with murder	0	0.0%	1	0.2%	1	0.2%	2	0.3%	5	0.8%	7	0.8%	0.0%	0.8%	
ERCPCP	0	0.0%	1	0.3%	0	0.0%	1	0.2%	4	1.0%	5	0.8%	0.0%	1.2%	
Progressive Life Center	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.5%	1	0.3%	1	0.5%	2	0.6%	0.0%	0.5%	
<i>Non-DC Youth Link youth</i>	1		0		3		5		13		18				

II.B Re-Arrest and Re-Petition

1. Youth re-arrested

Count of unique enrolled youth who are re-arrested by the Metropolitan Police Department.

	Quarter Comparison						Fiscal Year Comparison				Summary Data FY10 - Present				
	Q4		Prev. Qtr		This Qtr Last Yr		FY 2011		FY 2010		Total	%	Min	Max	Sparkline
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%					
DC Youth Link youth re-arrested	98	24%	88	17%	-	-	186	32%	-	-	186	27%	17%	24%	
ERCPCP	63	24%	58	17%	-	-	121	32%	-	-	121	26%	17%	24%	
Progressive Life Center	35	23%	30	17%	-	-	65	31%	-	-	65	26%	17%	23%	

* FY11 and Total percentages calculated as a percent of unique youth enrolled with DC YouthLink iat any time during FY11 Q3 -Q4. This included 528 total youth, 354 youth linked to ERCPCP and 182 youth linked to PLC.

2. Youth re-arrested, by top charge

	Quarter Comparison						Fiscal Year Comparison				Summary Data FY10 - Present				
	Q4		Prev. Qtr		This Qtr Last Yr		FY 2011*		FY 2010		Total	%	Min	Max	Sparkline
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%					
DC Youth Link															
Violent Felony	19	5%	13	2%	-	-	32	6%	-	-	32	6%	2%	5%	
Violent Misdemeanor	11	3%	17	3%	-	-	28	5%	-	-	28	5%	3%	3%	
Weapons	4	1%	5	1%	-	-	9	2%	-	-	9	2%	1%	1%	
Drug	20	5%	13	2%	-	-	33	6%	-	-	33	6%	2%	5%	
Property	32	8%	20	4%	-	-	52	9%	-	-	52	10%	4%	8%	
Public	1	0%	3	1%	-	-	4	1%	-	-	4	1%	0%	1%	
PINS	1	0%	0	0%	-	-	1	0%	-	-	1	0%	0%	0%	
Other	10	2%	17	3%	-	-	27	5%	-	-	27	5%	2%	3%	
Total DCYL Re-Arrests	98	24%	88	17%	-	-	186	32%	-	-	186	35%	17%	24%	
ERCPCP															
Violent Felony	12	5%	9	3%	-	-	21	5%	-	-	21	6%	3%	5%	
Violent Misdemeanor	6	2%	11	3%	-	-	17	4%	-	-	17	5%	2%	3%	
Weapons	3	1%	3	1%	-	-	6	2%	-	-	6	2%	1%	1%	
Drug	14	5%	11	3%	-	-	25	7%	-	-	25	7%	3%	5%	
Property	20	8%	12	3%	-	-	32	8%	-	-	32	9%	3%	8%	
Public	0	0%	2	1%	-	-	2	1%	-	-	2	1%	0%	1%	
PINS	1	0%	0	0%	-	-	1	0%	-	-	1	0%	0%	0%	
Other	7	3%	10	3%	-	-	17	4%	-	-	17	5%	3%	3%	
Total ERCPCP Re-Arrests	63	24%	58	17%	-	-	121	32%	-	-	121	34%	17%	24%	
Progressive Life Center															
Violent Felony	7	5%	4	2%	-	-	11	5%	-	-	11	6%	2%	5%	
Violent Misdemeanor	5	3%	6	3%	-	-	11	5%	-	-	11	6%	3%	3%	
Weapons	1	1%	2	1%	-	-	3	1%	-	-	3	2%	1%	1%	
Drug	6	4%	2	1%	-	-	8	4%	-	-	8	4%	1%	4%	
Property	12	8%	8	4%	-	-	20	9%	-	-	20	11%	4%	8%	
Public	1	1%	1	1%	-	-	2	1%	-	-	2	1%	1%	1%	
PINS	0	0%	0	0%	-	-	0	0%	-	-	0	0%	0%	0%	
Other	3	2%	7	4%	-	-	10	5%	-	-	10	5%	2%	4%	
Total PLC Re-Arrests	35	23%	30	17%	-	-	65	31%	-	-	65	36%	17%	23%	

* FY11 and Total percentages calculated as a percent of unique youth enrolled with DC YouthLink at any time during FY11 Q3 -Q4. This included 528 total youth, 354 youth linked to ERCPCP and 182 youth linked to PLC.

3. Youth Re-Petitioned

Count of unique enrolled youth who are re-petitioned following an arrest by the Metropolitan Police Department.

	Quarter Comparison						Fiscal Year Comparison				Summary Data FY10 - Present				
	Q4		Prev. Qtr		This Qtr Last Yr		FY 2011		FY 2010		Total	%	Min	Max	Sparkline
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%					
DC Youth Link Re-Petitions	87	21%	78	15%	-	-	165	28%	-	-	165	0.1793	15%	21%	
ERCPCP	55	21%	51	15%	-	-	106	28%	-	-	106	0.1718	15%	21%	
Progressive Life Center	32	21%	27	15%	-	-	59	28%	-	-	59	0.1657	15%	21%	

* FY11 and Total percentages calculated as a percent of unique youth enrolled with DC YouthLink iat any time during FY11 Q3 -Q4. This included 528 total youth, 354 youth linked to ERCPCP and 182 youth linked to PLC.

4. Youth re-petitioned - top charge

	Quarter Comparison						Fiscal Year Comparison				Summary Data FY10 - Present				
	Q4		Prev. Qtr		This Qtr Last Yr		FY 2011		FY 2010		Total	%	Min	Max	Sparkline
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%					
DC Youth Link															
Violent Felony	18	4%	11	2%	-	-	29	5%	-	-	29	3%	2%	4%	
Violent Misdemeanor	9	2%	15	3%	-	-	24	4%	-	-	24	3%	2%	3%	
Weapons	4	1%	4	1%	-	-	8	1%	-	-	8	1%	1%	1%	
Drug	20	5%	11	2%	-	-	31	5%	-	-	31	3%	2%	5%	
Property	25	6%	17	3%	-	-	42	7%	-	-	42	5%	3%	6%	
Public	0	0%	3	1%	-	-	3	1%	-	-	3	0%	0%	1%	
PINS	1	0%	0	0%	-	-	1	0%	-	-	1	0%	0%	0%	
Other	10	2%	17	3%	-	-	27	5%	-	-	27	3%	2%	3%	
DCYL Re-Petitions	87	21%	78	15%	-	-	165	28%	-	-	165	18%	15%	21%	
ERCPCP															
Violent Felony	11	4%	7	2%	-	-	18	5%	-	-	18	3%	2%	4%	
Violent Misdemeanor	4	2%	9	3%	-	-	13	3%	-	-	13	2%	2%	3%	
Weapons	3	1%	2	1%	-	-	5	1%	-	-	5	1%	1%	1%	
Drug	14	5%	9	3%	-	-	23	6%	-	-	23	4%	3%	5%	
Property	15	6%	12	3%	-	-	27	7%	-	-	27	4%	3%	6%	
Public	0	0%	2	1%	-	-	2	1%	-	-	2	0%	0%	1%	
PINS	1	0%	0	0%	-	-	1	0%	-	-	1	0%	0%	0%	
Other	7	3%	10	3%	-	-	17	4%	-	-	17	3%	3%	3%	
ERCPCP Re-Petitions	55	21%	51	15%	-	-	106	28%	-	-	106	17%	15%	21%	

* FY11 and Total percentages calculated as a percent of unique youth enrolled with DC YouthLink iat any time during FY11 Q3 -Q4. This included 581 total youth, 384 youth linked to ERCPCP and 212 youth linked to PLC.

4. Youth re-petitioned - top charge (cont'd)

Count of unique enrolled youth who are re-petitioned following an arrest by the Metropolitan Police Department. Includes youth who have been arrested while on abscondce from a placement while linked to a Lead.

	Quarter Comparison						Fiscal Year Comparison				Summary Data FY10 - Present				
	Q4		Prev. Qtr		This Qtr Last Yr		FY 2011		FY 2010		Total	%	Min	Max	Sparkline
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%					
Progressive Life Center															
Violent Felony	7	5%	4	2%	-	-	11	5%	-	-	11	3%	2%	5%	
Violent Misdemeanor	5	3%	6	3%	-	-	11	5%	-	-	11	3%	3%	3%	
Weapons	1	1%	2	1%	-	-	3	1%	-	-	3	1%	1%	1%	
Drug	6	4%	2	1%	-	-	8	4%	-	-	8	2%	1%	4%	
Property	10	7%	5	3%	-	-	15	7%	-	-	15	4%	3%	7%	
Public	0	0%	1	1%	-	-	1	0%	-	-	1	0%	0%	1%	
PINS	0	0%	0	0%	-	-	0	0%	-	-	0	0%	0%	0%	
Other	3	2%	7	4%	-	-	10	5%	-	-	10	3%	2%	4%	
PLC Re-Petitions	32	21%	27	15%	-	-	59	28%	-	-	59	17%	15%	21%	

II.C Revocation

1. Youth removed from community placements

	Quarter Comparison						Fiscal Year Comparison				Summary Data FY10* - Present				
	Q4		Prev. Qtr		This Qtr Last Yr		FY 2011		FY 2010*		Total	%	Min	Max	Sparkline
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%					
DC Youth Link Revocations	14	3%	18	3%	40	8%	68	9%	69	12%	137	15%	2.8%	7.8%	
ERCPCP	7	3%	13	4%	30	9%	48	10%	51	13%	99	16%	2.7%	9.2%	
Progressive Life Center	7	5%	5	3%	10	5%	20	7%	18	8%	38	11%	1.9%	5.3%	
<i>Non-DC Youth Link youth</i>	12		16		12		56		37		93				

* FY10 data collection began in January, 2010 and therefore does not include the first quarter. To allow for comparison of fiscal years, the FY10Q1 data has been substituted with a projection based on the average quarterly revocations from the remaining 3 quarters of FY10, calculated by taking the average rate of revocation for the three subsequent quarters and applying it to the first quarter population.

II.D Abscondence

1. Youth who absconded while enrolled in DC Youth Link

Count of unique youth who absconded at any point during the reporting period while enrolled with DC Youth Link.

	Quarter Comparison						Fiscal Year Comparison				Summary Data FY10 - Present				
	Q4		Prev. Qtr		This Qtr Last Yr		FY 2011		FY 2010		Total	%	Min	Max	Sparkline
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%					
DC Youth Link	48	12%	58	11%	93	18%	230	30%	183	31%	413	45%	9.7%	18.2%	
ERCPCP	31	12%	37	11%	65	20%	149	30%	129	33%	278	45%	10.6%	20.0%	
Progressive Life Center	21	14%	23	13%	33	17%	96	33%	69	31%	165	46%	11.7%	17.4%	

2. Abscondence one-day snap-shot

Count of unique youth on abscondence status on the final day of the reporting period while enrolled with DC YouthLink. Fiscal year values and aggregate calculation are calculated as the average number of youth on abscondence status at the end of each quarter within the fiscal year.

	Quarter Comparison						Fiscal Year Comparison				Summary Data FY10 - Present				
	Q4		Prev. Qtr		This Qtr Last Yr		FY 2011		FY 2010		Total	%	Min	Max	Sparkline
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%					
DC Youth Link	12	3%	31	6%	46	9%	29.5	6%	27	9%	28	7%	2.9%	11.2%	
ERCPCP	8	3%	19	5%	33	10%	19	6%	18	9%	19	7%	3.0%	10.6%	
Progressive Life Center	4	3%	12	7%	13	7%	11	6%	9	8%	10	7%	2.7%	14.9%	

II.E Linkage to Public Safety Focused Services

1. Linkage to a Public Safety-focused service

Count of unique youth linked to a public safety-focused service during the reporting period.

	Quarter Comparison						Fiscal Year Comparison				Summary Data FY10 - Present				
	Q4		Prev. Qtr		This Qtr Last Yr		FY 2011		FY 2010		Total	%	Min	Max	Sparkline
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%					
DC Youth Link															
Electronic Monitoring	173	43%	200	38%	15	3%	373	49%	17	3%	383	42%	0%	43%	
Intensive Third Party Monitoring	13	3%	51	10%	320	63%	302	40%	399	67%	491	53%	3%	93%	
DCYL Public Safety Linkages	180	44%	230	44%	324	63%	540	71%	401	68%	688	75%	44%	93%	
ERCPCP															
Electronic Monitoring	107	41%	139	40%	11	3%	251	51%	12	3%	257	42%	0%	45%	
Intensive Third Party Monitoring	7	3%	27	8%	195	60%	185	37%	295	76%	313	51%	3%	96%	
ERCPCP Public Safety Linkage	111	42%	156	45%	197	61%	351	71%	249	64%	446	72%	42%	96%	
Progressive Life															
Electronic Monitoring	66	44%	61	34%	4	2%	127	44%	5	2%	132	37%	0%	44%	
Intensive Third Party Monitoring	6	4%	24	13%	126	66%	122	42%	160	72%	193	54%	4%	89%	
PLC Public Safety Linkages	69	46%	74	42%	128	67%	199	68%	162	73%	265	74%	42%	89%	

III. Relationships

III.A Linkage to relationship-building services

1. Youth linked to relationship-building services, by type

Count of unique youth linked to a relationship-building service during the reporting period

	Quarter Comparison						Fiscal Year Comparison				Summary Data FY10 - Present				
	Q4		Prev. Qtr		This Qtr Last Yr		FY 2011		FY 2010		Total	%	Min	Max	Sparkline
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%					
DC Youth Link															
Mentoring	266	65%	296	57%	169	33%	512	68%	199	34%	566	62%	17%	67%	
Family Support/Reunification	5	1%	3	1%	0	0%	5	1%	0	0%	5	1%	0%	1%	
Youth Parenting Classes	3	1%	10	2%	8	2%	20	3%	7	1%	29	3%	0%	3%	
Functional Family Therapy	1	0%	2	0%	32	6%	21	3%	16	3%	51	6%	0%	7%	
Multi-Systemic Therapy	1	0%	3	1%	2	0%	6	1%	2	0%	8	1%	0%	1%	
Wrap Around Services	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0%	0%	
DCLY Relationship Linkages	271	67%	300	57%	191	37%	528	70%	209	35%	596	65%	21%	70%	
ERCPCP															
Mentoring	185	70%	220	63%	94	29%	354	71%	127	33%	386	63%	13%	70%	
Functional Family Therapy	0	0%	1	0%	12	4%	14	3%	9	2%	25	4%	0%	4%	
Youth Parenting Classes	0	0%	2	1%	8	2%	15	3%	7	2%	24	4%	0%	4%	
Wrap Around Services	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0%	0%	
Multi-Systemic Therapy	1	0%	1	0%	2	1%	6	1%	2	1%	8	1%	0%	2%	
ERCPCP Relationship Linkages	185	70%	221	64%	109	34%	362	73%	134	34%	403	65%	16%	73%	
Progressive Life															
Mentoring	83	56%	79	44%	75	39%	170	58%	72	32%	196	55%	16%	59%	
Family Support/Reunification	5	3%	3	2%	0	0%	5	2%	0	0%	5	1%	0%	3%	
Youth Parenting Classes	3	2%	2	1%	0	0%	5	2%	0	0%	5	1%	0%	2%	
Functional Family Therapy	1	1%	1	1%	20	11%	8	3%	7	3%	28	8%	1%	11%	
PLC Relationship Linkages	88	59%	82	46%	82	43%	179	62%	75	34%	211	59%	19%	62%	

Relationships

2. Youth linked to relationship-building services - by provider

Count of unique youth linked to a relationship-building service provider during the reporting period.

	Quarter Comparison						Fiscal Year Comparison				Summary Data FY10 - Present					
	Q4		Prev. Qtr		This Qtr Last Yr		FY 2011		FY 2010		Total	%	Min	Max	Sparkline	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%						
ERCPCP																
<i>Mentoring</i>																
+ JJ	63	24%	69	20%	0	0%	101	20%	14	4%	101	16%	0%	24%		
+ EE	36	14%	42	12%	3	1%	63	13%	10	3%	65	11%	0%	14%		
+ O	38	14%	38	11%	15	5%	83	17%	21	5%	86	14%	0%	14%		
+ A	0	0%	2	1%	0	0%	2	0%	0	0%	2	0%	0%	1%		
+ M	5	2%	7	2%	0	0%	10	2%	0	0%	10	2%	0%	3%		
+ GG	13	5%	18	5%	13	4%	36	7%	27	7%	41	7%	1%	9%		
+ B	0	0%	7	2%	12	4%	25	5%	19	5%	27	4%	0%	7%		
+ AA	10	4%	14	4%	0	0%	17	3%	0	0%	17	3%	0%	4%		
+ Y	10	4%	15	4%	0	0%	31	6%	6	2%	32	5%	0%	9%		
+ H	10	4%	8	2%	0	0%	12	2%	0	0%	12	2%	0%	4%		
+ X	9	3%	11	3%	10	3%	19	4%	14	4%	0	0%	0%	4%		
+ Z	1	0%	2	1%	3	1%	3	1%	1	0%	5	1%	0%	1%		
+ LL	0	0%	0	0%	23	7%	22	4%	19	5%	30	5%	0%	7%		
+ E	0	0%	3	1%	4	1%	8	2%	5	1%	12	2%	0%	1%		
+ U	2	1%	6	2%	0	0%	6	1%	0	0%	6	1%	0%	2%		
+ MM	0	0%	0	0%	8	2%	6	1%	6	2%	9	1%	0%	2%		
+ NN	0	0%	0	0%	10	3%	5	1%	5	1%	12	2%	0%	4%		
+ OO	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%	1	0%	1	0%	0%	0%		
+ P	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0%	0%		
+ PP	1	0%	1	0%	5	2%	1	0%	0	0%	7	1%	0%	2%		
+ N	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0%	0%		
+ WW	0	0%	1	0%	11	3%	0	0%	15	4%	15	2%	0%	3%		
Total Mentoring Linkages	185	70%	220	63%	94	29%	349	70%	127	33%	386	63%	13%	70%		
<i>Multi-Systemic Therapy</i>																
+ BB	1	0%	2	1%	2	1%	6	1%	2	1%	8	1%	0%	2%		
Total MST Linkages	1	0%	2	1%	2	1%	3	1%	2	1%	8	1%	0%	2%		
<i>Functional Family Therapy</i>																
QQ	0	0%	1	0%	12	4%	14	3%	9	2%	25	4%	0%	4%		
Total FFT Linkages	0	0%	1	0%	12	4%	5	1%	9	2%	25	4%	0%	4%		
<i>Wrap Around Services</i>																
+ RR	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0%	0%		
Total FFT Linkages	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0%	0%		

2. Youth linked to relationship-building services - by provider (cont'd)

Count of unique youth linked to a relationship-building service provider during the reporting period.

	Quarter Comparison						Fiscal Year Comparison				Summary Data FY10 - Present					
	Q4		Prev. Qtr		This Qtr Last Yr		FY 2011		FY 2010		Total	%	Min	Max	Sparkline	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%						
ERCPCP (cont'd)																
<i>Youth Parenting Classes</i>																
+ Q	0	0%	6	2%	0	0%	9	2%	0	0%	9	1%	0%	3%		
SS	0	0%	0	0%	5	2%	6	1%	6	2%	11	2%	0%	2%		
+ B	0	0%	2	1%	0	0%	2	0%	0	0%	2	0%	0%	1%		
TT	0	0%	0	0%	3	1%	1	0%	1	0%	6	1%	0%	1%		
Total Parenting Class Linkages	0	0%	8	2%	8	2%	15	3%	7	2%	24	4%	0%	4%		
ERCPCP Relationship Linkages	185	70%	221	64%	109	34%	357	72%	134	34%	403	65%	1%	73%		
Progressive Life																
<i>Mentoring</i>																
+ JJ	5	3%	4	2%	0	0%	6	2%	0	0%	6	2%	0%	3%		
+ EE	15	10%	13	7%	59	31%	61	21%	51	23%	91	26%	1%	31%		
+ O	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0%	1%		
+ M	28	19%	18	10%	0	0%	34	12%	0	0%	34	10%	0%	19%		
+ A	28	19%	35	20%	0	0%	50	17%	8	4%	50	14%	0%	28%		
+ AA	1	1%	1	1%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0%	1%		
+ Z	4	3%	4	2%	9	5%	13	4%	8	4%	17	5%	1%	6%		
+ B	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	2	1%	1	0%	2	1%	0%	1%		
+ H	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0%	1%		
+ LL	0	0%	0	0%	11	6%	9	3%	9	4%	15	4%	0%	7%		
+ V	0	0%	3	2%	0	0%	4	1%	0	0%	4	1%	0%	2%		
PP	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0%	1%		
UU	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%	1	0%	1	0%	0%	1%		
+ II	1	1%	1	1%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0%	1%		
WW	0	0%	0	0%	2	1%	0	0%	0	0%	2	1%	0%	1%		
Total Mentoring Linkages	83	56%	79	44%	75	39%	164	56%	72	32%	196	55%	16%	59%		
<i>Family Support/Reunification</i>																
+ KK	5	3%	3	2%	0	0%	5	2%	0	0%	5	1%	0%	3%		
Total Family Support Linkages	5	3%	3	2%	0	0%	5	2%	0	0%	5	1%	0%	3%		
<i>Youth Parenting Classes</i>																
+ A	3	2%	2	1%	0	0%	5	2%	0	0%	5	1%	0%	2%		
Total Parenting Class Linkages	3	2%	2	1%	0	0%	5	2%	0	0%	5	1%	0%	2%		

2. Youth linked to relationship-building services - by provider (cont'd)

Count of unique youth linked to a relationship-building service provider during the reporting period.

	Quarter Comparison					
	Q4		Prev. Qtr		This Qtr Last Yr	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Progressive Life (cont'd)						
<i>Functional Family Therapy</i>						
+ VV	1	1%	1	1%	20	11%
WW	1	1%	1	1%	0	0%
Total FFT Linkages	1	1%	1	1%	20	11%
PLC Relationship Linkages	88	59%	82	46%	82	43%

Fiscal Year Comparison			
FY 2011		FY 2010	
#	%	#	%
8	3%	7	3%
0	0%	0	0%
8	3%	7	3%
173	59%	75	34%

Summary Data FY10 - Present					
Total	%	Min	Max	Sparkline	
28	8%	1%	11%		
1	0%	0%	2%		
28	8%	1%	11%		
211	59%	19%	62%		

III.B Engagement with relationship-building activities

1. Average weekly hours of contact per youth

	Quarter Comparison					
	Hours per Week		Activities per Week		Hours per Activity	
	Q4	Q3*	Q4	Q3*	Q4	Q3*
DC Youth Link						
Mentor	3.9	4.8	1.5	2.5	2.7	1.9
Family Support/Reunification	1.6	-	0.5	-	3.5	-
Youth Parenting Class	3.8	5.3	1.3	3.1	2.9	1.7
Total Youth Linked	3.9	4.8	1.5	2.5	2.7	1.9
ERCPCP						
Mentor	3.8	4.5	1.4	2.5	2.6	1.8
Youth Parenting Class	-	2.8	-	2.0	-	1.4
Total Youth Linked	3.8	4.5	1.4	2.5	2.6	1.8
Progressive Life						
Mentor	4.3	5.6	1.6	2.6	2.7	2.2
Family Support/Reunification	1.6	-	0.5	-	3.5	-
Youth Parenting Class	3.8	7.8	1.3	3.5	2.9	2.2
Total Youth Linked	4.2	5.5	1.5	2.6	2.8	2.1

Fiscal Year Comparison

Hours per Week	
FY11*	FY10
3.7	-
1.2	-
5.7	-
3.7	-
3.5	-
2.8	-
3.5	-
4.1	-
1.2	-
6.7	-
4.1	-

Summary Data

Hours per Week		
Min	Max	Sparkline
3.9	4.8	
1.6	1.6	
3.8	5.3	
3.9	4.8	
3.8	4.5	
2.8	2.8	
3.8	4.5	
4.3	5.6	
1.6	1.6	
3.8	7.8	
4.2	5.5	

2. Average weekly hours of contact per youth, by provider

	Quarter Comparison					
	Hours per Week		Activities per Week		Hours per Activity	
	Q4	Q3*	Q4	Q3*	Q4	Q3*
ERCPCP						
<i>Mentoring</i>						
+ JJ	4.5	5.8	1.4	2.0	3.1	2.9
+ EE	3.3	4.3	0.8	1.1	1.7	1.6
+ O	2.1	2.8	1.6	2.4	2.7	2.5
+ M	3.9	6.7	1.6	2.4	2.3	2.8
+ GG	6.1	5.9	2.1	1.2	2.8	5.0
+ AA	2.6	4.8	0.8	1.6	3.1	2.9
+ Y	2.1	2.9	0.7	1.2	2.9	2.5
+ H	3.2	3.6	1.3	1.3	2.5	2.7
+ X	3.1	-	1.1	-	2.9	-
+ Z	2.2	0.8	1.4	0.6	1.6	1.3
+ U	3.8	4.4	1.1	3.4	3.5	1.3
+ XX	-	4.2	-	1.4	-	3.0
Total Mentoring Engagement	3.8	4.5	1.4	1.8	2.6	2.5
<i>Youth Parenting Classes</i>						
+ Q	-	2.8	-	1.4	-	2.0
Total Parenting Class Linkages	-	2.8	-	1.4	-	2.0
Total Linkages	3.8	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Progressive Life						
<i>Mentoring</i>						
+ EE	2.0	3.7	1.4	2.4	1.4	1.6
+ AA	2.7	5.4	2.5	3.0	2.7	2.6
+ JJ	8.6	10.4	1.5	1.8	3.4	3.5
+ M	4.2	5.3	1.5	1.8	2.9	2.9
+ A	5.8	6.7	1.9	2.4	3.0	2.8
+ Z	0.8	2.1	0.5	1.3	1.5	1.6
+ II	2.2	0.7	1.0	0.2	2.3	3.0
Total Mentoring Engagement	4.3	5.6	1.6	2.2	2.7	2.6
<i>Family Support/Reunification</i>						
+ KK	1.6	-	0.5	-	3.5	-
Total Parenting Class Linkages	1.6	-	0.5	-	3.5	-
<i>Youth Parenting Classes</i>						
+ A	6.3	7.8	2.1	2.2	2.9	3.5
Total Parenting Class Linkages	6.3	7.8	2.1	2.2	2.9	3.5
Total Linkages	4.2	5.6	1.5	2.2	2.8	2.6

Fiscal Year Comparison

	Hours per Week	
	FY11*	FY10
	4.4	-
	3.2	-
	2.1	-
	4.4	-
	4.9	-
	2.7	-
	2.0	-
	2.9	-
	2.2	-
	1.0	-
	4.1	-
	4.2	-
Total	3.5	-
	2.8	-
Total	2.8	-
Total	3.5	-
	2.3	-
	3.3	-
	8.1	-
	4.1	-
	5.5	-
	1.0	-
	1.6	-
Total	4.1	-
	1.2	-
Total	1.2	-
	6.7	-
Total	3.7	-
Total	4.1	-

Summary Data

	Hours per Week		
	Min	Max	Sparkline
	4.5	5.8	
	3.3	4.3	
	2.1	2.8	
	3.9	6.7	
	5.9	6.1	
	2.6	4.8	
	2.1	2.9	
	3.2	3.6	
	3.1	3.1	
	0.8	2.2	
	3.8	4.4	
	4.2	4.2	
Total	3.8	4.5	
	2.8	2.8	
Total	2.8	2.8	
Total	3.8	4.5	
	2.0	3.7	
	2.7	5.4	
	8.6	10.4	
	4.2	5.3	
	5.8	6.7	
	0.8	2.1	
	0.7	2.2	
Total	4.3	5.6	
	1.6	1.6	
Total	1.6	1.6	
	6.3	7.8	
Total	6.3	7.8	
Total	4.2	5.6	

IV. Work

IV.A Linkage to a work readiness program

1. Youth linked to a work readiness program, by type

Count of unique youth linked to a work readiness service during the reporting period.

	Quarter Comparison						Fiscal Year Comparison				Summary Data FY10 - Present				
	Q4		Prev. Qtr		This Qtr Last Yr		FY 2011		FY 2010		Total	%	Min	Max	Sparkline
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%					
DC Youth Link	117	29%	126	24%	58	11.3%	200	26%	63	10.6%	221	24%	4%	29%	
ERCPCP	73	28%	78	22%	30	9.2%	115	23%	37	9.5%	129	21%	0%	28%	
Progressive Life Center	45	30%	48	27%	27	14.2%	88	30%	26	11.7%	95	27%	3%	30%	

2. Youth linked to a work readiness program - by provider

Count of unique youth linked to a work readiness service provider during the reporting period.

	Quarter Comparison						Fiscal Year Comparison				Summary Data FY10 - Present				
	Q4		Prev. Qtr		This Qtr Last Yr		FY 2011		FY 2010		Total	%	Min	Max	Sparkline
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%					
ERCPCP															
<i>Workforce Development</i>															
+ R	51	19%	43	12%	29	9%	73	15%	30	8%	84	14%	3%	19%	
+ T	1	0%	5	1%	0	0%	7	1%	0	0%	7	1%	0%	1%	
+ YY	6	2%	0	0%	0	0%	6	1%	0	0%	6	1%	0%	2%	
+ Q	9	3%	14	4%	0	0%	14	3%	0	0%	14	2%	0%	4%	
+ O	8	3%	14	4%	0	0%	17	3%	0	0%	17	3%	0%	4%	
+ K	1	0%	7	2%	0	0%	7	1%	0	0%	7	1%	0%	2%	
ZZ	1	0%	1	0%	1	0%	1	0%	1	0%	0	0%	0%	0%	
+ M	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0%	0%	
PP	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%	1	0%	1	0%	2	0%	0%	0%	
WW	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%	1	0%	0%	0%	
Total WFD Linkages	73	28%	78	22%	31	10%	115	23%	32	8%	128	21%	3%	28%	
Progressive Life															
<i>Workforce Development</i>															
+ R	25	17%	33	19%	18	9%	57	20%	21	9%	60	17%	2%	23%	
+ T	15	10%	11	6%	0	0%	24	8%	0	0%	24	7%	0%	10%	
+ YY	8	5%	0	0%	0	0%	8	3%	0	0%	8	2%	0%	5%	
+ Q	1	1%	4	2%	0	0%	4	1%	0	0%	4	1%	0%	2%	
+ O	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0%	1%	
+ MM	0	0%	0	0%	9	5%	1	0%	4	2%	9	3%	0%	5%	
WW	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	1%	2	1%	0%	1%	
Total Linkages	45	30%	48	27%	27	14%	88	30%	25	11%	95	27%	3%	30%	

3. Youth linked to a work readiness program - by age

Count of unique youth linked to a work readiness service during the reporting period. Age calculated as the age of the youth on the final day of the reporting period.

	Quarter Comparison						Fiscal Year Comparison			
	Q4		Prev. Qtr		This Qtr Last Yr		FY 2011		FY 2010	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
DC Youth Link										
Under 18	29	19%	22	12%	17	7%	38	12%	12	3%
Over 18	89	35%	104	30%	42	16%	162	38%	45	19%
ERCPCP										
Under 18	20	20%	18	15%	6	4%	26	12%	7	3%
Over 18	54	33%	60	27%	25	16%	89	32%	25	16%
Progressive Life										
Under 18	10	18%	4	7%	11	12%	13	11%	5	4%
Over 18	35	37%	44	36%	17	18%	75	45%	25	27%

Summary Data FY10 - Present

Min	Max	Sparkline
0%	19%	
0%	35%	
0%	20%	
0%	33%	
0%	18%	
0%	37%	

III.B Engagement with a work readiness activities

1. Average weekly hours of contact per youth

	Quarter Comparison					
	Hours per Week		Activities per Week		Hours per Activity	
	Q4	Q3	Q4	Q3	Q4	Q3
DC Youth Link	3.7	4.4	1.2	1.6	2.9	2.8
ERCPCP	3.0	4.2	1.0	1.7	3.0	2.5
Progressive Life	4.9	5.6	1.6	1.4	2.8	4.0

Fiscal Year Comparison

Hours per Week	
FY11	FY10
3.6	-
2.8	-
4.9	-

Summary Data

Hours per Week		
Min	Max	Sparkline
3.7	4.4	
3.0	4.2	
4.9	5.6	

2. Average weekly hours of contact per youth, by provider

	Quarter Comparison					
	Hours per Week		Activities per Week		Hours per Activity	
	Q4	Q3	Q4	Q3	Q4	Q3
ERCPCP						
<i>Job Readiness</i>						
+ T	3.3	3.5	1.5	0.9	2.3	3.8
+ YY	4.8	-	1.3	-	3.8	-
+ O	2.3	4.2	0.9	1.7	2.5	2.4
Total Job Readiness Engagemer	3.0	4.2	1.0	1.7	3.0	2.5
Progressive Life						
<i>Job Readiness</i>						
+ T	5.4	5.6	2.0	1.4	2.7	4.0
+ YY	3.9	-	1.0	-	3.9	-
Total Mentoring Engagement	4.9	5.6	1.6	1.4	2.1	4.0

Fiscal Year Comparison

Hours per Week	
FY11	FY10
3.4	-
4.8	-
2.4	-
2.8	-
5.4	-
3.9	-
4.9	-

Summary Data

Hours per Week		
Min	Max	Sparkline
3.3	3.5	
4.8	4.8	
2.3	4.2	
3.0	4.2	
5.4	5.6	
3.9	3.9	
4.9	5.6	

V. Education

V.A Educational Outcomes

1. Youth achieving a high school credential

Count of unique youth linked to an educational support service during the reporting period whose records indicate that they have achieved either a high school diploma or a GED credential.

	Quarter Comparison			Fiscal Year Comparison		Summary Data FY10 - Present			
	Q4	Prev. Qtr	This Qtr Last Yr	FY 2011	FY 2010	Total	Min	Max	Sparkline
DC Youth Link	2	9	-	11	-	11	2	9	
ERCPCP									
+ I	2	9	-	11	-	11	2	9	

V.B. Linkage to an educational-support service

1. Youth linked to an educational support services, by type

Count of unique youth linked to an educational support service during the reporting period.

	Quarter Comparison						Fiscal Year Comparison				Summary Data FY10 - Present				
	Q4		Prev. Qtr		This Qtr Last Yr		FY 2011		FY 2010		Total	%	Min	Max	Sparkline
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%					
DC Youth Link															
Academic Support	26	6%	42	8%	30	16%	120	16%	41	7%	153	17%	1%	12%	
Tutoring	37	9%	99	19%	43	23%	132	17%	53	9%	191	21%	4%	23%	
Educational Advoacy	8	3%	13	2%	0	0%	15	2%	0	0%	15	2%	0%	4%	
GED	4	1%	8	2%	2	1%	10	1%	4	1%	10	1%	0%	2%	
DCYL Education Linkages	86	21%	153	29%	83	44%	265	35%	88	15%	301	33%	6%	35%	
ERCPCP															
Academic Support	26	10%	55	16%	30	16%	75	15%	30	8%	99	16%	1%	18%	
Tutoring	20	8%	80	23%	12	6%	109	22%	23	6%	119	19%	1%	23%	
GED	2	1%	6	2%	1	1%	8	2%	3	1%	9	1%	0%	2%	
Educational Advoacy	8	3%	13	4%	0	0%	15	3%	0	0%	15	2%	0%	4%	
ERCPCP Education Linkages	53	20%	120	34%	41	22%	173	35%	50	13%	191	31%	4%	34%	
Progressive Life															
Academic Support	17	11%	13	7%	14	7%	46	16%	11	5%	57	16%	1%	13%	
Tutoring	17	11%	19	11%	31	16%	60	21%	30	14%	72	20%	7%	25%	
GED	2	1%	2	1%	1	1%	2	1%	1	0%	2	1%	0%	1%	
PLC Education Linkages	34	23%	33	19%	42	22%	94	32%	38	17%	114	32%	9%	34%	

2. Youth linked to an educational support service - by provider

Count of unique youth linked to an educational support service during the reporting period.

	Quarter Comparison						Fiscal Year Comparison				Summary Data FY10 - Present				
	Q4		Prev. Qtr		This Qtr Last Yr		FY 2011		FY 2010		Total	%	Min	Max	Sparkline
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%					
ERCPCP															
<i>Academic Support</i>															
+ I	24	9%	39	11%	28	9%	70	14%	28	7%	95	15%	1%	16%	
J	2	1%	1	0%	0	0%	4	1%	0	0%	4	1%	0%	1%	
+ C	0	0%	2	1%	2	1%	3	1%	2	1%	3	0%	0%	1%	
ERCPCP Academic Support Li	26	10%	42	12%	30	9%	75	15%	30	8%	99	16%	1%	18%	
<i>Educational Advocy</i>															
+ N	8	3%	13	4%	0	0%	15	3%	0	0%	15	2%	0%	4%	
ERCPCP Educational Advocy	8	3%	13	4%	0	0%	88	18%	30	8%	99	16%	0%	4%	
<i>Tutoring</i>															
+ N	11	4%	28	8%	0	0%	30	6%	0	0%	30	5%	0%	8%	
+ JJ	3	1%	30	9%	0	0%	51	10%	17	4%	51	8%	0%	12%	
+ O	3	1%	9	3%	0	0%	13	3%	0	0%	13	2%	0%	3%	
+ H	2	1%	4	1%	0	0%	5	1%	0	0%	5	1%	0%	1%	
+ AA	1	0%	6	2%	0	0%	6	1%	0	0%	6	1%	0%	2%	
+ MM	0	0%	0	0%	4	1%	3	1%	3	1%	1	0%	0%	1%	
+ C	1	0%	8	2%	8	2%	2	0%	3	1%	20	3%	0%	2%	
+ B	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	2	0%	0	0%	2	0%	0%	1%	
+ WW	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%	1	0%	0%	1%	
ERCPCP Tutoring Linkages	20	8%	80	23%	12	4%	109	22%	23	6%	119	19%	1%	23%	
<i>GED</i>															
+ I	0	0%	1	0%	1	0%	2	0%	1	0%	2	0%	0%	1%	
+ N	1	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0%	0%	
G	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	2	0%	0%	1%	
S	1	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	1	0%	1	0%	0%	0%	
DD	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	1	0%	1	0%	0%	0%	
+ W	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0%	0%	
FF	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0%	1%	
WW	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0%	0%	
ERCPCP GED Linkages	2	1%	6	2%	1	0%	8	2%	3	1%	9	1%	0%	2%	
ERCPCP Education Linkages	53	20%	120	34%	41	13%	173	35%	50	13%	191	31%	4%	34%	

2. Youth linked to an educational support service - by provider (cont'd)

	Quarter Comparison						Fiscal Year Comparison				Summary Data FY10 - Present				
	Q4		Prev. Qtr		This Qtr Last Yr		FY 2011		FY 2010		Total	%	Min	Max	Sparkline
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%					
Progressive Life															
<i>Academic Support</i>															
+ I	13	9%	7	4%	0	0%	17	6%	0	0%	18	5%	0%	9%	
J	4	3%	4	2%	0	0%	5	2%	0	0%	5	1%	0%	3%	
D	0	0%	1	1%	1	1%	14	5%	4	2%	14	4%	0%	6%	
+ HH	0	0%	0	0%	10	5%	10	3%	5	2%	19	5%	0%	5%	
AAA	0	0%	0	0%	2	1%	2	1%	2	1%	2	1%	0%	1%	
+ L	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0%	1%	
WW	0	0%	0	0%	2	1%	0	0%	3	1%	3	1%	0%	1%	
PLC Academic Support Linkages	17	11%	13	7%	14	7%	46	16%	11	5%	57	16%	1%	13%	
<i>Tutoring</i>															
+ JJ	11	7%	15	8%	0	0%	19	7%	0	0%	19	5%	0%	8%	
UU	0	0%	0	0%	31	16%	41	14%	30	14%	54	15%	0%	22%	
+ W	4	3%	3	2%	0	0%	5	2%	0	0%	5	1%	0%	3%	
+ I	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0%	1%	
+ II	1	1%	1	1%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0%	1%	
PLC Tutoring Linkages	17	11%	19	11%	31	16%	60	21%	30	14%	72	20%	7%	25%	
<i>GED</i>															
WW	1	1%	1	1%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0%	1%	
G	1	1%	1	1%	1	1%	1	0%	1	0%	1	0%	0%	1%	
PLC GED Linkages	2	1%	2	1%	1	1%	2	1%	1	0%	2	1%	0%	1%	
PLC Education Linkages	34	23%	33	19%	42	22%	94	32%	38	17%	114	32%	9%	34%	

3. Youth linked to an educational support service - by age

Count of unique youth linked to an educational support service during the reporting period. Age calculated as the age of the youth on the final day of the reporting period.

	Quarter Comparison						Fiscal Year Comparison				Summary Data FY10 - Present		
	Q4		Prev. Qtr		This Qtr Last Yr		FY11		FY10		Min	Max	Sparkline
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%			
DC Youth Link													
Under 18	29	19%	58	32%	40	16%	86	26%	44	13%	0%	32%	
Over 18	57	23%	95	28%	43	17%	179	42%	44	19%	0%	30%	
ERCPCP													
Under 18	17	17%	44	36%	18	11%	54	25%	26	12%	0%	36%	
Over 18	36	22%	76	34%	23	14%	115	41%	24	15%	0%	34%	
Progressive Life													
Under 18	12	22%	14	25%	22	23%	28	23%	18	14%	0%	28%	
Over 18	22	23%	19	16%	20	21%	66	39%	20	22%	0%	30%	

V.C Engagement with educational support activities

1. Average weekly hours of contact per youth

	Quarter Comparison						Fiscal Year Comparison		Summary Data		
	Hours per Week		Activities per Week		Hours per Activity		Hours per Week		Min	Max	Sparkline
	Q4	Q3	Q4	Q3	Q4	Q3	FY11	FY10			
DC Youth Link											
Academic Support	7.4	8.3	2.5	2.8	3.0	3.0	6.4	-	7.4	8.3	
Educational Advocacy	0.6	1.1	0.4	0.8	1.6	1.4	0.9	-	0.6	1.1	
Tutoring	3.0	5.6	1.1	2.2	2.7	2.6	3.4	-	3.0	5.6	
GED	0.8	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.5	0.0	0.6	-	0.0	0.8	
DCYL Educational Engagemen	5.2	6.3	1.8	2.3	2.9	2.7	4.6	-	5.2	6.3	
ERCPCP											
Academic Support	7.7	8.9	2.6	3.0	3.0	3.0	6.3	-	7.7	8.9	
Educational Advocacy	0.6	1.1	0.4	0.8	1.6	1.4	0.9	-	0.6	1.1	
Tutoring	2.1	5.4	0.8	2.1	2.5	2.6	3.4	-	2.1	5.4	
GED	0.8	0.0	0.1	0.5	1.2	0.0	0.6	-	0.0	0.8	
ERCPCP Educational Engagem	4.9	6.3	1.7	2.3	2.9	3.7	4.5	-	4.9	6.3	
Progressive Life											
Academic Support	7.1	3.8	2.4	1.3	2.9	3.0	6.5	-	3.8	7.1	
Tutoring	3.9	6.5	1.4	2.6	2.8	2.5	4.1	-	3.9	6.5	
PLC Educational Engagement	5.5	6.1	1.9	2.4	2.9	2.6	5.1	-	5.5	6.1	

1. Average weekly hours of contact per youth, by provider

	Quarter Comparison						Fiscal Year Comparison		Summary Data		
	Hours per Week		Activities per Week		Hours per Activity		Hours per Week		Hours per Week		
	Q4	Q3	Q4	Q3	Q4	Q3	FY11	FY10	Min	Max	Sparkline
ERCPCP											
<i>Academic Support</i>											
+ I	7.7	8.9	2.6	3.0	3.1	3.0	6.3	-	7.7	8.9	
ERCPCP Acad. Sup. Engagem	7.7	8.9	2.6	3.0	3.1	3.0	6.3	-	7.7	8.9	
<i>Educational Advocacy</i>											
+ N	0.6	1.1	0.4	0.8	1.6	1.4	0.9	-	0.6	1.1	
ERCPCP Educ. Adv. Engagem	0.6	1.1	0.4	0.8	1.6	1.4	0.9	-	0.6	1.1	
<i>Tutoring</i>											
+ N	0.9	2.0	0.7	1.0	1.2	2.0	1.1	-	0.9	2.0	
+ JJ	6.1	8.8	2.7	3.2	2.3	2.8	8.7	-	6.1	8.8	
+ O	3.2	2.2	2.0	1.1	1.6	1.9	1.9	-	2.2	3.2	
+ H	0.0	2.6	0.1	1.4	0.0	1.9	1.6	-	0.0	2.6	
+ AA	8.4	7.5	1.5	1.4	5.5	5.3	8.1	-	7.5	8.4	
+ C	1.9	-	0.9	-	2.0	-	1.9	-	1.9	1.9	
ERCPCP Tutoring Engagement	2.1	5.4	0.8	2.1	2.5	2.6	3.4	-	2.1	5.4	
<i>GED</i>											
+ N	0.8	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.6	0.0	0.6	-	0.0	0.8	
ERCPCP GED Engagement	0.8	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.6	0.0	0.6	-	0.0	0.8	
ERCPCP Educational Engagem	4.9	6.3	1.7	1.7	3.0	2.7	4.5	-	4.9	6.3	
Progressive Life											
<i>Academic Support</i>											
+ I	7.1	3.8	2.4	1.3	2.9	3.0	6.5	-	3.8	7.1	
PLC Acad. Sup. Engagement	7.1	3.8	2.4	1.3	2.9	3.0	6.5	-	3.8	7.1	
<i>Tutoring</i>											
+ JJ	5.2	7.4	1.7	2.9	3.1	2.6	5.1	-	5.2	7.4	
+ W	1.9	4.3	1.0	1.9	1.9	2.3	2.1	-	1.9	4.3	
+ II	2.3	2.3	0.9	0.7	2.4	3.3	2.3	-	2.3	2.3	
PLC Tutoring Engagement	3.9	6.5	1.4	2.6	2.8	2.5	4.1	-	3.9	6.5	
PLC Educational Engagement	5.5	6.1	1.9	2.4	2.9	2.6	5.1	-	5.5	6.1	

VI. Health

VI.A Linkage to a health-focused service

1. Youth linked to a health-focused service, by type

Count of unique youth linked to a health-focused service during the reporting period.

	Quarter Comparison						Fiscal Year Comparison				Summary Data FY10 - Present				
	Q4		Prev. Qtr		This Qtr Last Yr		FY 2011		FY 2010		Total	%	Min	Max	Sparkline
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%					
DC Youth Link															
Physical Activity	45	11%	63	12%	32	17%	93	12%	37	6%	109	12%	2%	12%	
Mental/Behavioral Health	27	7%	34	7%	27	14%	55	7%	8	1%	59	6%	0%	8%	
Substance Abuse Intervention	17	4%	18	3%	7	4%	50	7%	20	3%	67	7%	1%	6%	
Community-Based Intervention	6	1%	4	1%	2	1%	7	1%	2	0%	9	1%	0%	1%	
Anger Management	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0%	0%	
DCYL Health Linkages	91	22%	116	22%	67	35%	190	25%	65	11%	220	24%	6%	22%	
ERCPCP															
Physical Activity	32	12%	54	16%	32	17%	79	16%	37	9%	95	15%	3%	18%	
Mental/Behavioral Health	18	7%	31	9%	4	2%	41	8%	5	1%	41	7%	0%	11%	
Substance Abuse Intervention	5	2%	9	3%	14	7%	19	4%	10	3%	30	5%	1%	4%	
Community-Based Intervention	6	2%	4	1%	1	1%	6	1%	1	0%	8	1%	0%	2%	
Anger Management	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0%	0%	
ERCPCP Health Linkages	61	23%	95	27%	50	26%	136	27%	51	13%	158	26%	4%	31%	
Progressive Life															
Physical Activity	13	9%	9	5%	0	0%	14	5%	0	0%	14	4%	0%	9%	
Mental/Behavioral Health	10	7%	3	2%	3		15	5%	3	1%	19	5%	1%	7%	
Substance Abuse Intervention	12	8%	9	5%	13	7%	32	11%	10	5%	38	11%	3%	10%	
Community-Based Intervention	1	1%	0	0%	1	1%	2	1%	1	0%	2	1%	0%	1%	
PLC Health Linkages	32	21%	21	12%	17	9%	57	20%	14	6%	65	18%	4%	21%	

2. Youth linked to a health-focused service, by provider

Count of unique youth linked to a health-focused service during the reporting period.

	Quarter Comparison						Fiscal Year Comparison				Summary Data FY10 - Present					
	Q4		Prev. Qtr		This Qtr Last Yr		FY 2011		FY 2010		Total	%	Min	Max	Sparkline	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%						
ERCPCP																
<i>Physical Activity</i>																
+ P	26	10%	47	14%	32	17%	63	13%	31	8%	79	13%	3%	16%		
+ O	7	3%	5	1%	0	0%	8	2%	0	0%	8	1%	0%	3%		
+ L	0	0%	2	1%	0	0%	15	3%	6	2%	15	2%	0%	4%		
ERCPCP Physical Activity Link	32	12%	54	16%	32	17%	79	16%	37	9%	95	15%	3%	18%		
<i>Mental/Behavioral Health</i>																
+ Q	5	2%	13	4%	0	0%	17	3%	0	0%	17	3%	0%	4%		
BBB	9	3%	8	2%	2	1%	14	3%	3	1%	14	2%	0%	4%		
CCC	1	0%	2	1%	0	0%	3	1%	0	0%	3	0%	0%	1%		
DDD	1	0%	2	1%	1	1%	2	0%	1	0%	2	0%	0%	1%		
EEE	1	0%	1	0%	1	1%	1	0%	1	0%	1	0%	0%	0%		
+ FFF	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0%	0%		
+ GGG	1	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0%	0%		
+ CC	1	0%	1	0%	0	0%	2	0%	0	0%	2	0%	0%	0%		
HHH	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0%	0%		
ERCPCP Mental Health Linkag	18	7%	31	9%	4	2%	41	8%	5	1%	41	7%	0%	11%		
<i>Substance Abuse Intervention</i>																
+ Q	4	2%	6	2%	0	0%	8	2%	0	0%	8	1%	0%	2%		
III	1	0%	3	1%	14	7%	10	2%	8	2%	21	3%	0%	4%		
+ A	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	0%	2	1%	2	0%	0%	1%		
ERCPCP Substance Abuse Link	5	2%	9	3%	14	7%	19	4%	10	3%	30	5%	1%	4%		
<i>Community-Based Intervention</i>																
BBB	2	1%	1	0%	0	0%	2	0%	0	0%	2	0%	0%	1%		
CCC	1	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0%	0%		
DDD	1	0%	1	0%	1	1%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0%	1%		
JJJ	1	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	1	0%	1	0%	0%	0%		
III	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0%	0%		
WW	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	1%	2	0%	0%	0%		
ERCPCP CBI Linkages	6	2%	4	1%	1	1%	6	1%	1	0%	8	1%	0%	2%		
<i>Anger Management</i>																
+ GGG	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0%	0%		
ERCPCP Anger Management L	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0%	0%		
ERCPCP Health Linkages	60	23%	95	27%	50	26%	136	27%	51	13%	158	26%	4%	31%		

2. Youth linked to health focused services, by provider (cont'd)

	Quarter Comparison						Fiscal Year Comparison				Summary Data FY10 - Present				
	Q4		Prev. Qtr		This Qtr Last Yr		FY 2011		FY 2010		Total	%	Min	Max	Sparkline
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%					
Progressive Life															
<i>Physical Activity</i>															
+ L	13	9%	9	5%	0	0%	14	5%	0	0%	14	4%	0%	9%	
Total Linkages	13	9%	9	5%	0	0%	14	5%	0	0%	14	4%	0%	9%	
<i>Mental/Behavioral Health</i>															
+ Q	8	5%	2	1%	0	0%	8	3%	0	0%	9	3%	0%	5%	
BBB	2	1%	0	0%	1	1%	4	1%	1	0%	4	1%	0%	1%	
CCC	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0%	1%	
FFF	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	1	0%	1	0%	1	0%	0%	1%	
+ GGG	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	1	0%	1	0%	1	0%	0%	1%	
WW	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	1%	3	1%	0%	3%	
Total Mental Health Linkages	10	7%	3	2%	3	2%	15	5%	3	1%	19	5%	1%	7%	
<i>Substance Abuse Intervention</i>															
+ A	11	7%	9	5%	0	0%	26	9%	4	2%	26	7%	0%	10%	
LLL	0	0%	0	0%	13	7%	6	2%	7	3%	14	4%	0%	7%	
WW	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0%	1%	
Total Substance Abuse Linkage	12	8%	9	5%	13	7%	32	11%	10	5%	38	11%	3%	10%	
<i>Community-Based Intervention</i>															
JJJ	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0%	1%	
BBB	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	1	0%	1	0%	1	0%	0%	1%	
Total CBI Linkages	1	1%	0	0%	1	1%	2	1%	1	0%	2	1%	0%	1%	
Total Health Linkages	32	21%	21	12%	17	9%	57	20%	14	6%	65	18%	4%	21%	

Health

3. Youth linked to a health-focused service, by age

	Quarter Comparison						Fiscal Year Comparison				Summary Data FY10 - Present		
	Q4		Prev. Qtr		This Qtr Last Yr		FY11		FY10		Min	Max	Sparkline
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%			
DC Youth Link													
Under 18	50	32%	53	30%	38	15%	83	25%	33	10%	0%	32%	
Over 18	41	16%	63	18%	29	11%	107	25%	32	14%	0%	21%	
ERCPCP													
Under 18	33	33%	43	35%	27	16%	58	27%	24	11%	0%	35%	
Over 18	28	17%	52	23%	23	14%	78	28%	27	17%	0%	26%	
Progressive Life													
Under 18	17	31%	10	18%	11	12%	25	20%	9	7%	0%	31%	
Over 18	15	16%	11	9%	6	6%	32	19%	5	5%	0%	16%	

VI.B Engagement with health-focused activities

1. Average Hours of Contact per Week

	Quarter Comparison						Fiscal Year Comparison		Summary Data		
	Hours per Week		Activities per Week		Hours per Activity		Hours per Week		Hours per Week		
	Q4	Q3	Q4	Q3	Q4	Q3	FY11	FY10	Min	Max	Sparkline
DC Youth Link											
Physical Activity	5.2	5.2	1.7	1.8	3.0	3.0	4.9	-	5.2	5.2	
Mental/Behavioral Health	0.7	0.8	0.6	0.8	1.2	0.9	0.7	-	0.7	0.8	
Substance Abuse	3.6	2.5	1.5	1.4	2.4	1.8	2.7	-	2.5	3.6	
DCYL Health Engagement	4.2	4.5	1.5	1.7	2.8	2.7	3.9	-	4.2	4.5	
ERCPCP											
Physical Activity	4.3	5.7	1.5	1.9	3.0	3.0	4.5	-	4.3	5.7	
Mental/Behavioral Health	0.6	0.8	0.4	0.8	1.3	0.9	0.6	-	0.6	0.8	
Substance Abuse	0.8	0.7	0.8	0.7	1.0	1.0	0.7	-	0.7	0.8	
ERCPCP Health Engagement	3.5	4.6	1.2	1.7	2.8	2.7	3.6	-	3.5	4.6	
Progressive Life											
Physical Activity	7.4	2.6	2.5	0.9	3.0	3.0	6.5	-	2.6	7.4	
Mental/Behavioral Health	0.9	-	0.7	-	1.2	-	0.9	-	0.9	0.9	
Substance Abuse	6.0	6.1	2.4	3.0	2.5	2.1	5.7	-	6.0	6.1	
PLC Health Engagement	5.4	3.7	2.0	1.5	2.7	2.4	4.9	-	3.7	5.4	

2. Average Hours of Contact per Week, by provider

	Quarter Comparison					
	Hours per Week		Activities per Week		Hours per Activity	
	Q4	Q3	Q4	Q3	Q4	Q3
ERCPCP						
<i>Physical Activity</i>						
+ P	4.7	6.1	1.6	2.0	3.0	3.0
+ O	3.6	4.1	1.5	1.8	2.5	2.3
ERCPCP Physical Activity Engage	4.3	5.7	1.4	1.9	3.0	3.0
<i>Mental/Behavioral Health</i>						
+ Q	0.6	0.8	0.4	0.8	1.3	0.9
ERCPCP Mental Health Engage	0.6	0.8	0.4	0.8	1.3	0.9
<i>Substance Abuse</i>						
+ Q	0.8	0.7	0.8	0.7	1.0	1.0
ERCPCP Substance Abuse Engage	0.8	0.7	0.8	0.7	1.0	1.0
ERCPCP Health Engagement	3.5	4.6	1.2	1.7	2.8	2.7
Progressive Life						
<i>Physical Activity</i>						
+ L	7.4	2.6	2.5	0.9	3.0	3.0
PLC Physical Activity Engagemen	7.4	2.6	2.5	0.9	3.0	3.0
<i>Mental/Behavioral Health</i>						
+ Q	0.9	-	0.7	-	1.2	-
PLC Mental Health Engagemen	0.9	-	0.7	-	1.2	-
<i>Substance Abuse</i>						
+ A	6.0	6.1	2.4	3.0	2.5	2.1
PLC Substance Abuse Engagemen	6.0	6.1	2.4	3.0	2.5	2.1
PLC Health Engagement	5.4	3.7	2.0	1.5	2.7	2.4

Fiscal Year Comparison

	Hours per Week	
	FY11	FY10
	4.9	-
	3.4	-
	4.5	-
	0.6	-
	0.6	-
	0.7	-
	0.7	-
	3.6	
		-
	6.5	-
	6.5	-
	0.9	-
	0.9	-
	5.7	-
	5.7	-
	4.9	

Summary Data

	Hours per Week		
	Min	Max	Sparkline
	4.7	6.1	
	3.6	4.1	
	4.3	5.7	
	0.6	0.8	
	0.6	0.8	
	0.7	0.8	
	0.7	0.8	
	3.5	4.6	
	2.6	7.4	
	2.6	7.4	
	0.9	0.9	
	0.9	0.9	
	6.0	6.1	
	6.0	6.1	
	3.7	5.4	

VII. Community

VII.A Linkage to a community participation service

1. Youth linked to a community participation services, by type

Count of unique youth linked to a community participation service during the reporting period.

	Quarter Comparison						Fiscal Year Comparison				Summary Data FY10 - Present				
	Q4		Prev. Qtr		This Qtr Last Yr		FY 2011		FY 2010		Total	%	Min	Max	Sparkline
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%					
DC Youth Link	3	1%	1	0%	2	0%	3	0%	1	0%	4	0.4%	0%	0.7%	
ERCPCP	2	1%	0	0%	1	0%	2	0%	0	0%	3	0.5%	0%	0.8%	
Progressive Life Center	1	1%	1	1%	1	1%	1	0%	1	0%	1	0.3%	0%	0.7%	

2. Youth linked to a community participation service, by provider

	Quarter Comparison						Fiscal Year Comparison				Summary Data FY10 - Present				
	Q4		Prev. Qtr		This Qtr Last Yr		FY 2011		FY 2010		Total	%	Min	Max	Sparkline
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%					
ERCPCP															
Community Participation															
+ MMM	2	1%	0	0%	0	0%	2	0%	0	0%	2	0%	0%	1%	
WW	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0%	0%	
ERCPCP Community Part. Lin	2	1%	0	0%	1	0%	2	0%	0	0%	3	0%	0%	1%	
Progressive Life															
Community Participation															
AAA	1	1%	1	1%	1	1%	1	0%	1	0%	1	0%	0%	1%	
PLC Community Part. Linkages	1	1%	1	1%	1	1%	1	0%	1	0%	1	0%	0%	1%	

3. Youth linked to a community participation service, by age

	Quarter Comparison						Fiscal Year Comparison				Summary Data FY10 - Present		
	Q4		Prev. Qtr		This Qtr Last Yr		FY11		FY10		Min	Max	Sparkline
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%			
DC Youth Link													
Under 18	0	0%	0	0%	2	1%	0	0%	1	0%	0%	1%	
Over 18	3	1%	1	0%	0	0%	3	1%	0	0%	0%	1%	
ERCPCP													
Under 18	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0%	1%	
Over 18	2	1%	0	0%	0	0%	2	1%	0	0%	0%	1%	
Progressive Life													
Under 18	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	1	1%	0%	1%	
Over 18	1	1%	1	1%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	0%	1%	

VII.B Engagement with community participation activities

1. Average Hours of Contact per Week

	Quarter Comparison						Fiscal Year Comparison		Summary Data		
	Hours per Week		Activities per Week		Hours per Activity		Hours per Week		Hours per Week		
	Q4	Q3	Q4	Q3	Q4	Q3	FY11	FY10	Min	Max	Sparkline
DC Youth Link	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.0	0.0	
ERCPCP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.0	0.0	
Progressive Life	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.0	0.0	

VIII. Creativity

VIII.A Linkage to a creative expression service

1. Youth linked to a creative expression service

Count of unique youth linked to a community participation service during the reporting period.

	Quarter Comparison						Fiscal Year Comparison				Summary Data FY10 - Present				
	Q4		Prev. Qtr		This Qtr Last Yr		FY 2011		FY 2010		Total	%	Min	Max	Sparkline
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%					
DC Youth Link	3	1%	5	1%	8	2%	12	2%	8	1%	17	1.8%	0%	2%	
ERCPCP	3	1%	5	1%	8	2%	12	2%	8	2%	17	2.8%	0%	2.5%	
Progressive Life Center	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0.0%	0%	0.0%	

2. Youth linked to a creative expression service, by provider

	Quarter Comparison						Fiscal Year Comparison				Summary Data FY10 - Present				
	Q4		Prev. Qtr		This Qtr Last Yr		FY 2011		FY 2010		Total	%	Min	Max	Sparkline
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%					
ERCPCP															
<i>Creative Expression</i>															
+ GG	3	1%	4	2%	8	4%	11	2%	8	2%	16	3%	0	8	
+ AA	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0	1	
ERCPCP Creative Expression I	3	1%	5	3%	8	4%	12	2%	8	2%	17	3%	0	8	
Progressive Life															
<i>Creative Expression</i>															
PLC Creative Expression Linka	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0	

3. Youth linked to a creative expression service, by age

	Quarter Comparison						Fiscal Year Comparison				Summary Data FY10 - Present		
	Q4		Prev. Qtr		This Qtr Last Yr		FY11		FY10		Min	Max	Sparkline
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%			
DC Youth Link													
Under 18	1	1%	2	1%	5	2%	7	2%	5	2%	0%	3%	
Over 18	2	1%	3	1%	3	1%	5	2%	3	1%	0%	1%	
ERCPCP													
Under 18	1	1%	2	2%	5	3%	7	2%	5	2%	0%	4%	
Over 18	2	1%	3	1%	3	2%	5	2%	3	1%	0%	2%	
Progressive Life													
Under 18	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0%	0%	
Over 18	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0%	0%	

VIII.B Engagement with a creative expression service

1. Average Hours of Contact per Week

	Quarter Comparison						Fiscal Year Comparison		Summary Data		
	Hours per Week		Activities per Week		Hours per Activity		Hours per Week		Hours per Week		
	Q4	Q3	Q4	Q3	Q4	Q3	FY11	FY10	Min	Max	Sparkline
DC Youth Link	8.7	5.4	2.7	1.0	3.2	5.3	6.7	-	6.3	7.6	
ERCPCP	8.7	5.4	2.7	1.0	3.2	5.3	6.7	-	6.3	7.6	
Progressive Life	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

2. Average Contact per Week per Youth - by Service Coalition Member

	Quarter Comparison						Fiscal Year Comparison		Summary Data		
	Hours per Week		Activities per Week		Hours per Activity		Hours per Week		Hours per Week		
	Q4	Q3	Q4	Q3	Q4	Q3	FY11	FY10	Min	Max	Sparkline
ERCPCP											
+ GG	8.7	5.4	2.7	1.0	3.2	5.3	6.7	-	5.4	8.7	
ERCPCP Creativity Engagemer	8.7	5.4	2.7	1.0	3.2	5.3	6.7	-	5.4	8.7	