



**Project YES:
*Promoting Youth Engagement
And Success***

**Lessons Learned in Sustaining Systemic Change to
Improve Graduation Rates for Youth Placed At-Risk:
Final Grant Summary Report**

Project YES was funded from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act No Child
Left Behind, Title IV Part A Governor's Program

January, 2011

Table of Contents

Project Overview	1
Lessons Learned: Reflections on Partnership Practices over the Term of the Grant	1
Lesson One: Build partnerships in service to specific goals	4
Lesson Two: Empowerment matters	5
Lesson Three: Anticipate and manage external influences	6
Lesson Four: Trust matters	7
Lesson Five: Persistence matters	8
Lesson Six: Get the timing right	9
Lesson Seven: Celebrate small wins.....	11
Sustaining Network Impact.....	12
Summary and Recommendations	13
Works Cited	16
Attachment 1: Grantee Project Summary Carlton County Public Health and Human Services	17
Attachment 2: Grantee Project Summary Carver-Scott Educational Cooperative (CSEC)	19
Attachment 3: Grantee Project Summary Cass Lake-Bena Public Schools ..	21
Attachment 4: Grantee Project Summary Hennepin County/Minneapolis School District/Intermediate School District 287	23
Attachment 5: A summary demographic description of the youth served through the four initiatives.....	26

Project Overview

In 2007, the Minnesota Department of Education allocated \$1 million made available through the U.S. Department of Education Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities Act (CFDA 84.186B) to four school-community partnerships focused on increasing high school graduation rates and reducing drop-out rates among high-risk populations. The competitive grants provided program funding from October 2007 through September 2009, with additional evaluation and training funds extended through June 2010.

Promoting Youth Engagement and Success (Project YES) was a pilot-site initiative designed to be a learning lab and catalyst for systemic changes that would increase high school graduation rates and decrease juvenile justice system involvement among school-aged youth who are disproportionately represented in the juvenile justice system, or who exhibit high rates of teen pregnancy, illegal alcohol/drug use rates, or other indicators that may be linked to ongoing problems making a successful transition to productive adulthood. Systemic change was facilitated through collaborations between education, juvenile justice, and children's mental health systems, as well as community partners and nonprofit organizations specific to each grantee community.

The initiative included collaborative networks in five counties:

- Carlton County (primary grantee was Carlton County Public Health and Human Services).
- Carver and Scott Counties (primary grantee was the Carver-Scott Educational Cooperative [CSEC]).
- Cass County (primary grantee was the Cass Lake-Bena Public School District and the Leech Lake Reservation).
- Hennepin County (primary grantee was the Minneapolis Public Schools and Intermediate School District 287, serving suburban Hennepin County).

Grant recipients were each required to address three primary Project YES goals:

1. Increase graduation rates.
2. Decrease contact with the juvenile justice system.
3. Create sustainable systemic changes within some or all participating organizations.

This evaluation report provides a cross-site summary of lessons learned primarily related to the goal of sustaining systemic change. Individual project overviews and summaries of project-reported outcomes related to goals one and two are included here as **Attachments 1-4**. A summary demographic description of the youth served through the four initiatives is included here as **Attachment 5**.

LESSONS LEARNED: REFLECTIONS ON PARTNERSHIP PRACTICES OVER THE TERM OF THE GRANT

Lesson One: Build partnerships in service to specific goals

Grantees observed **that collaboration in service to specific youth-focused goals is helpful because it provides a targeted purpose for working together** (not just a “we should really work together more because we both serve the same kids” focus). **Including youth from the outset as a partner as well as a program participant ensures that the individuals most impacted by the work have a voice in how programs will be delivered and evaluated.** In many respects the Minnesota Department of Education’s goals for this project (increased graduation rates, decreased involvement with juvenile justice), gave purpose and structure to cross-agency efforts. A deeper and more community-relevant drill-down of those goals could best occur in partnership with those whose behavior or status was expected to change. The grantees provided observations and illustrations partnerships and change.

This work changes our way of doing business—it is not just about co-location, but about understanding each other, not just for the sake of knowing each other better, but for the sake of increasing graduation outcomes for kids we both serve. That gives us a reason for working together.

The process of systems learning about each other is a crucial first step; it should not be undervalued, even though it is time consuming. Still, we can’t just sit around and learn about each other; we need to be doing something for it to have any meaning.

One thing we learned [across the two partnering counties] is that we collect and track recidivism data differently. This makes it really difficult to gather accurate data on juvenile justice contacts for kids. So, we worked together to agree on a common definition of recidivism [this took time!!!] and then on a common system for compiling the data. Now, for the first time, we are able to compile accurate baseline data to really understand what is happening with kids.

We see value in interdependence: shared [or similar] goals, shared fiscal responsibility [at least for this grant] and shared risk. It helps keep us really focused on outcomes for kids.

We learned that to get students off probation, we needed to work very closely with Probation officers. Sometimes the best way to get a student off probation was to keep him on a little longer, until he was ready to stand alone.

When we have goals to work toward, data-based decision making is key—are we actually making a difference for kids and families?

Lesson Two: Empowerment matters

Grantees came to realize that knowing WHO within each network organization should engage in the partnership can be as important as knowing WHAT needs to be done. They observed that *effective* cross-organizational partnering often occurs at a level where staff are empowered to make service delivery decisions quickly (especially if something isn't working) but not so high a level that the focus is more on policy than on direct service. Grantee reports provided examples of empowerment and its effects.

When we get out of the way and let the right people in the right positions do this [partnership] work we are helping them to own the future, not just to own their jobs.

Transparency across our organizations is important; we have to be honest with each other about things like funding, the limits of what we can and cannot do, and our beliefs about boundaries (with families, program participants, staff). Sometimes the best partners [across organizations] are not the highest level decision makers, but those of us who do the work with kids and families on a day-to-day basis. Still, we have to know our limits and we can't over-promise.

By [each participating organization] focusing on aligning our current operations with best known practices we build stronger alliances. It's about doing better work for kids and families.

This work may not lead to dramatic change across our entire system, but we hope it can be a model for the larger systems. It starts with the delivery of effective and connected services—and that must include the people on the ground doing the work.

It was a struggle for me to figure out how much authority I had when I transitioned to being the site coordinator from probation liaison. I was expected to fulfill the liaison duties at two different programs as well as take on the Grant Extension roles. Moreover, I was going to be stepping into the shoes of [a strong predecessor], which was a heavy task. Many of our constituents were still feeling lack of direction and understanding of the collaborative efforts. However, I found that the rapport I had established in my role as liaison had provided the perfect foundation to gain the ears of department heads and administrators when I eventually decided to exercise my voice. But none of my efforts would have been successful without the empowerment and trust of the leadership across agencies.

Lesson Three: Anticipate and manage external influences

One key lesson learned in all of the project sites was that external influences—both positive and negative—are powerful forces that must be addressed. Often they cannot be predicted or controlled, they just *are*. The network has to be prepared to manage (or build on) these outside influences as they occur. Here are some examples:

External influences that *enhanced* the work of partnerships

Supporters of the work

There were several key people outside the partnership that served as champions for solution focused practices across multiple levels in multiple organizations and disciplines. These practices were supported by youth, parents, staff and administration at CSEC, Social Services and juvenile justice organizations).

Sufficient funding

Adequate financial resources through the grant to fund training, expert consulting personnel and instructional supplies enabled us to fully implement the main components of Project YES and enabled (the) Project YES program director to modify and adapt (the) program based on (the) formative assessment from participants.

The collaborative board decided to fund (the) young parent program, universal home visiting, truancy, and family school workers positions long term from remaining Local Collaborative Time Study (Federal DHS) funds. This source of funding came at a crucial time.

New Technologies

Data collection about behavior incidences was enhanced by the fact that all districts began using new technologies for student data management. We needed to be ready to adapt when that happened.

External influences that impeded the work of partnerships

Funding reduction or termination

Increased financial challenges for network partners led to decreasing enrollment and reduced revenue streams for programs and staff.

Budget cuts across social service and educational sectors resulted in challenges in scheduling and consistent representation at planning and development meetings for this project.

Decreasing enrollment and revenue leads to cuts in staff and increased resistance to the adoption of new strategies and programs.

Staff challenges

Unionization of staff at CSEC associated with decreasing staff morale and an increase in “political” tension and conflict.

Staff layoffs due to drop in enrollment associated with down-turn in economy.

Inconsistent practices across stakeholder groups

Districts are not unified in student data management systems so it is sometimes hard to collect or categorize data.

Lesson Four: Trust matters

The grantees who felt they had established strong and enduring networks stressed the importance of making sure partners across agencies or sectors “have each other’s backs”. This was especially important when partners were taking risks within their own organization for the good of the network.

There was a high degree of trust required among all partnering organizations, staff, consulting personnel, and participants. We depend on a genuine and authentic appreciation for what the other person (either professional or client) brings to the relationship. The professional needs to trust the client’s capacity to be their own expert on what works, and what they truly want (goals). Many clients may not be familiar with being placed in this position, so the professional needs to keep asking questions that honor the client and help him/her discover the positive things they have experienced and their true hopes for the future.

Administration needs to trust staff to act in professional and responsible manner when they give authority to staff to modify or change the traditional way of doing things (disrupt the status quo). Staff needs to trust administration that they will honor their honest attempts when they take risks by trying something new to help their students.

Organizational partners need to trust each other that they will follow through on their agreements and focus on what is going well with each organization and not “bad mouth” the other organization when “mistakes” or less than optimal results occur.

As a principal, a member of the Leech Lake Band, and a graduate of Cass Lake High School, I had a history and connection to the education director for the Tribe, who was also a Leech Laker and CLBS graduate. We now had a reason to build on our existing connections.

A great degree of trust has been achieved at the county collaborative level, after many years of working together. One example of this trust happens in the process of “case consulting” regarding issues and intervention strategies for specific students. Over time, a highly successful case consulting process involving probation, the district attorney, truancy officer, social workers, the diversion program, school districts, family school support workers, public health mental health workers and reservation representatives have met weekly to discuss kids and what would be the best placements, situations, consequences, and strategies to work with each individual child. Meeting over the common concern of the child’s welfare assures that everyone has the same information from which to make the best decision, in the least restrictive environment, that results in the best outcome for the child concerned.

Working as the probation liaison as well as site coordinator, I have had to advocate on every side and be careful to do the least harm and stand with integrity because I have to maintain the trust of all parties from students and parents to police officers, attorneys, and POs, then of course teachers, aids, and administrative staff. But it was well worth the juggling act because when it was time to move forward to make things happen, people moved a little faster, attitudes were a little lighter, and the faith that we could come up with something good was there. Building trust takes time, but it pays off.

Lesson Five: Persistence matters

Grantees agreed, if a proposed strategy doesn’t work the first time, it’s important to know when to move on and know when to KEEP AT IT.

CSEC discovered during the first six months of Project YES that recruiting youth for the project was proving to be a greater challenge than expected. The Project YES Leadership Team decided to expand the recruitment efforts to include youth engaged in other programs, and used Project YES as a compliment to existing programs. This enabled more youth to become involved, and also provided greater opportunity to identify those activities that worked best. These lessons learned were then incorporated into professional development and youth engagement strategies.

Persistence was necessary to follow through on what appeared to be working. The professional learning community format was working, but many thought early on that it was not going to have an impact on their practice that would justify the time and expense. Some of the strongest early critics have now become some of our greatest champions of the solution-focused PLC model of professional development.

Persistence was key when working with administration to give certain programs/strategies time to work, and giving staff sufficient authority to make programmatic changes that would promote optimal success. This new system needed time for staff to build trust with students, and prove to them that they were sincere about empowering students to take greater control of their own behavior, lesson plans and goal setting. Our formative assessments had to be designed to acknowledge the time necessary to get up to speed.

We were persistent in working with the youth on mental health issues, but we learned that we needed a different mental health position, so we moved from a chemical health specialist to a social worker.

Every single collaborative board members hears reports about truancy, credit recovery, skills assistant progress, and unified behavior incidence reporting. Superintendents from all the school districts sit across from each other at this meeting. Progress at various sites is often shared and affirmed. This repeated exposure has resulted in various system changes across the school districts. In one case, a school that had at first responded in a rather hostile manner to the concept of credit recovery ended up putting a recovery program into place.

Because services take place in a Federal Setting Four Educational placement (for students needing special education services) graduation from the school program would not represent whether or not students accessed and received mental health services and supports. Most of our students' extenuating circumstances do not reach resolution upon completion, or even continuation, of educational services. This is complicated more by the fact that our students tend to be highly mobile, transitioning between correctional, residential and school placements even within one school year. We need to take the long view here. Educating families and students about accessing existing services will have a longer impact on student success after educational services are done.

Lesson Six: Get the timing right

Knowing WHEN can be as important as knowing WHAT. Different partners in a network may be ready to innovate, compromise, or try new things at different times. Being sensitive to the timing needs of different partners helps ensure that progress is ultimately made.

The times that we experienced the greatest and most productive interagency collaboration was when we amplified what was already working well for each respective partnering organization. We "fanned the flame" when we felt they were ready and created a greater sense of urgency for enhancing what each organization was doing well that aligned with our common mission and goals. For example, juvenile justice had "tested the waters" with motivational interviewing with staff and found it very helpful. Once this was discovered, and

research revealed that the essential components of MI complimented what CSEC wanted to do to promote solution-focused practices; we engaged juvenile justice leadership in dialogue on how we could expand and sustain these efforts.

We continually realized that the timing [for introducing a partnership strategy] is best when the intervention builds on what already works in order to address a current challenge or fulfill a current mission or goal of the partnering agency.

When the school districts started implementing new technologies for student record keeping, we knew that was when they'd be ready to talk about aligning their efforts. If we had pushed this too soon, they wouldn't have been ready and they probably would have refused.

Through a situation that involved staff turnover, new awareness of an unenforced ordinance, and policy shifts with regard to this issue, Fond du Lac came more into line with what was happening in the rest of the county regarding youth truancy. This year, because the timing was right, the countywide truancy officer was asked to be in court on the reservation regarding several student truanancies. This resulted in consequences that were more similar to those experienced by other county students. In addition, the truancy officer position on the reservation was shifted to one more affiliated with law enforcement. A task force was put together around this issue, and progress in achieving more congruent consequences is now under way.

In January, the site coordinator started meeting with department heads about expanding YES efforts, learning from the YES project, and bringing attention to this specific population across county services. They were ready to move. By June, the KEYS Conference was held and meetings were scheduled between Hennepin County Human Services, Office of Multicultural Services, a Grad and Juvenile Probation, as well as the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis Public Schools, NorthPoint, and Minnesota Department of Education. I don't think this would have happened a year ago.

Lesson Seven: Celebrate. It is fun *and* instructive

Sharing success stories is obviously more pleasant than focusing on what isn't working. In listening to other project sites discuss successes and pitfalls, however, grantees observed that success stories about individual students or families can not only be inspiring, they can also be instructive and provide a micro-to-macro model for improving or focusing the work (e.g., this was a positive outcome for Sam. How can we make this happen for others like Sam?).

We had a probation officer come to visit the house that a group of kids was building [including youth currently working with this probation officer]. It completely changed the way this guy sees our kids and the positive things they can do—and it changed the way the kids see this probation officer [as someone who really cares about them as people]. So now we ask ourselves, how can we create more situations like this to build positive adult interactions for students?

Sometimes changes are small, but significant, “tweaks” in how we do the work—and they make all the difference. We can use the same “solution-focused interventions” with adults that we use with kids. We ask specific kids: “Who really helped you out? Who helped you succeed or achieve your goal?” Then we go to that adult and ask them what they think they did that made the difference in that particular instance. We learn from their success. That way we can amplify and build off what people do well—and what people do that we already know has made a difference.

It's kind of like defensive driving. If a driver wants to avoid sliding into oncoming traffic, they should focus their attention on the side of the road where they DO want to be going, not on the oncoming traffic where they DON'T want to be. Same is true with building strong partnerships.

Sustaining network impact

Not surprisingly, the issue of funding is central to the question of sustaining specific program elements. All of the four initiatives funded through Project YES have sought additional funding to continue their work. Some have successfully shifted existing funds to support key aspects, but this is increasingly difficult given the substantial reduction in state funding for most partner school districts and juvenile justice partners.

Regardless of whether or not the specific initiatives funded through this grant are sustained, the lessons learned (outlined above) have altered the practices of the partners involved. Beyond that, however, grantees were asked what specific aspects of Project YES they expect will remain at the end of the funding cycle (whether or not they secure additional funding). Their responses reflect three key elements often cited in the literature about sustaining interagency networks: **communication, coordination of services, relationship-building** (Goldsmith and Eggers, Salamon, Provan, Crutchfield and Grant).

Network communication

Collaborative dialogue and communication focused on youth in level III and IV, special education settings (programs for students in need of special education services) kept us working together and focused on the important work.

We will continue to make use of technology to stay in constant communication with our partners (email listservs, e-newsletters, websites).

Coordination of service delivery across the network

Our juvenile justice programs will continue to utilize motivational interviewing when engaging youth on probation, and will continue to track recidivism rates in an aligned manner.

Our social services programs will continue to promote solution-focused practices in all school-embedded mental health services.

Consultants we worked with during Project YES plan to publish results of the project, and continue to champion the benefits of solution-focused practices in their consulting practice with other school districts, social and mental health services and juvenile justice agencies.

Our cross-agency liaison model for collaborative programs will continue.

The YES Skills Assistance Program has evolved into the YES Skills Assistance Mentor program. The new program has added a stronger focus on postsecondary preparation. At the present time, an application is being considered for second year support of this program by the Great Lakes Scholarship Foundation.

Family school support workers, the young parent program, universal home visits, and the truancy officer position will continue as long as we can secure funding.

We anticipate that the cross-district alignment of behavior incidence data collection will continue to be refined and that a unified system will eventually emerge. This unified system could greatly assist the county in being eligible for funding for things such as a data collection demonstration site or site for uniformly imposed consequences for behavior.

Relationships among network partners

All partnerships that were developed because of YES funding will continue-the task force involving reservation partners around truancy issues, partnerships among teachers and administrators around credit recovery, and the evolution of the Restorative Justice Program.

We will always have the increased respect, trust, and communication between agencies that was developed during this project.

The learning community we established between YES Grantees and partnering programs will continue.

Summary and Recommendations

Social change requires broad cross-sector coordination, yet the social sector remains focused on the isolated intervention of individual organizations. Substantially greater progress could be made in alleviating many of our most serious and complex social problems if nonprofits, governments, businesses, and the public were brought together around a common agenda to create collective impact.

Stanford Social Innovation Review, Winter 2011.

The five counties and four initiatives highlighted in this report represent a wide range of intervention strategies designed to address the needs of youth at highest risk for poor developmental outcomes (including dropping out of school, teen pregnancy, and involvement with the juvenile justice system). These five counties are largely dissimilar in their demographic makeup, their geographic location, their urbanicity, and the availability of specific youth-serving programs. The initiatives themselves are dissimilar in their approach to achieving the stated goals of Project YES. Consequently, it is beyond the scope of this evaluation to judge or compare the merit of each initiative's specific interventions. Rather, each initiative is described in the attachments to this report, complete with a project overview, each project's stated goals, a listing of network partners, and summary statements about the initiatives progress toward Project YES goals. A demographic summary of youth served through these four initiatives is also included (see Attachment 5).

Unlike the separate and distinct youth interventions employed, *all* of the initiatives were charged with establishing sustainable systemic changes within some or all participating organizations. Consequently, a cross-initiative analysis of what worked and what didn't work in the process of creating this systemic change yields rich lessons learned (identified above) and provides strong support for encouraging a primary focus on sustained communication, coordination, and relationship building in future interagency initiatives (see comments in previous section of this report).

None of this is particularly new information. So, the question remains: *Why do we so frequently do so little of what we know appears to work when it comes to sustaining networks or collaborative systemic change?*

One of the observations from this cross-site analysis was the distinction between **knowing** what works and **doing** what works. So, one key recommendation is to advise future interagency and cross-sector initiatives to review and discuss these lessons learned and then establish concrete and specific plans for how they, as a team, will address them (accentuate the possibilities; minimize the pitfalls).

For funders looking to identify the network or collaborative conditions that should be in place early on, these five factors appear to be key to success (and, consequently, they could be basic requirements for funding or support) (see Stanford Innovation Review, 2011):

1. **Ensuring stakeholder relevance and stakeholder voice** (*Are there concrete and specific mechanisms in place to ensure that the interventions to be employed hold relevance for the primary program participants [in this case, youth]? Is it clear that youth are engaged in establishing all subsequent factors of success [see #2-6 below]?*).
2. **Establishing a common agenda** (*Is there a shared vision for change and a common understanding of the problems to be addressed?*)
3. **Agreeing on a few shared measures of success** (*Is there a plan to collect, review, and use information that all partners agree is relevant, feasible, and reflective of the work?*)
4. **Implementing mutually reinforcing activities** (*If partners have differentiated activities is there agreement about how these align with, complement, extend, or support each other? Are you creating an organizational win-win?*)
5. **Committing to continuous communication** (*Is the communication viewed by all partners as sufficient for building trust, maintaining focus on objectives, and sustaining motivation for the shared work?*)
6. **Identifying a “backbone” organization** (*Is there a partner organization or entity [could be more than one, but likely not all] that can serve as the glue to hold the work together and ensure coordination?*)

Work Cited

Leslie R. Crutchfield and Heather McLeod Grant. (2008). *Forces for Good: The Six Practices of High Impact Nonprofits*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publisher.

Lester M. Salamon, (2002). "The New Governance and the Tools of Public Action: An Introduction." *The Tools of Government*. Oxford University Press, New York.

Goldsmith, Stephen and William D. Eggers. (2004). *Governing by Network: The New Shape of the Public Sector*. Brookings Institution Press: Washington, DC.

Provan, Keith G., Mark A. Veazie, Lisa K. Staten and Nicolette I. Teufel-Shone (2005). "The Use of Network Analysis to Strengthen Community Partnerships." *Public Administration Review* 65(5):603-613.

Stewart, Suzanne, (2009). "*Participatory Action Research: Exploring Indigenous Youth Perspective and Experiences.*" *Indigenous Policy Journal* Vol. XX, No 3.

This report was prepared by:

Laura Bloomberg, Ph.D. Center for Integrative Leadership, University of Minnesota
Nancy Riestenberg, School Climate Specialist, Minnesota Department of Education

Carol Thomas, Director, Safety, Health and Nutrition Division, Minnesota Department of Education

ATTACHMENT 1

GRANTEE PROJECT SUMMARY

Carlton County Public Health and Human Services

Project Overview

Carlton County Family Services Collaborative proposed several system changes and the expansion of services designed to *increase the developmental assets* for those youth most at risk across the county in an effort to improve graduation rates and reduce youth involvement in the criminal justice system.

Using the Outcomes for Teens Youth Outcomes Compendium as a resource to guide research-based strategy development, the collaborative focused on asset development that can occur through wrap-around strategies which address four realms of development: 1) Educational Attainment: Achievement Motivation/Parent Involvement; 2) Health and Safety: Mental Health, 3) Social and Emotional Development: Civic Engagement; and, 4) Self-Sufficiency: Work as an Element of Self-Sufficiency. The programs, linkages and services established were all based on research of similar programs which have proven effective in meeting YES goals:

1. Development of a resource and referral team.
2. Court-ordered parent education for the parents/guardians of students with high incidences of unexcused absences.
3. Skills assistant positions in all county high schools.
4. Children's mental health workers to provide parent education and family support.
5. Expansion of the Young Parent Program.
6. Extended coordination for the REACH program.
7. Truancy officer support.

Target Population

- Court-involved youth and their families.
- Youth at risk of not graduating (grades 7-12).
- Students with mental health issues.
- Students with truancy issues.
- Young mothers showing depression on screening.

Network Partners

- Countywide truancy officer.
- Juvenile justice system.
- Public health.
- Children's mental health.
- REACH program.
- Police liaison
- Children and family service collaborative

- County-wide participation across eight school districts including one reservation school district.

Proposed Project Goals

Goal #1: Improve academic outcomes for youth whose graduation is in jeopardy.

Indicator 1A: Documentation of academic deficits/interventions

Indicator 1B: Documentation of academic performance spring/fall

Indicator 1C: Pre-post school investment and satisfaction survey

Indicator 1D: Reduction in attrition after 9th grade.

Goal #2 Decrease number of students who commit infractions that place them in the juvenile justice system.

Indicator 2A: Truancy prevention program records.

Indicator 2B: Expected increases in student attendance.

Progress Toward Project YES Goals (see individual project reports for a full summary of outcome measures related to specific initiatives)

Decrease in contact with the juvenile justice system.

Teen parents' depression screenings showed improvement over time; failure to meet child development benchmarks decreased among the teen parents' babies.

There was a 64 percent decrease in juvenile cases from 2006-07 to 2008-09 (343 cases to 121 cases).

Increased graduation rates

School-based skills assistants (SA) and the Truancy Officer worked with identified at-risk youth; 23 of 25 and 35 of 35 of these youth graduated on time over 2 years. Youth self-reports of feeling accepted at school, interest, trust, motivation, respect for diversity and sense that adults care about them increased. Thirty-eight percent-forty-three percent of students served by SAs showed an improvement in attendance: Fifty-four percent of American Indian Students showed an improvement in attendance. Parents evaluated highly the court-ordered parenting classes (Cooperative Discipline).

Systems change

The collaborative board voted to keep some of the YES programs funded: Young Parents, Family School Support Workers, and Truancy Intervention. The skills assistant mentors were funded for the past two years under the Great Lakes Foundation. The county commissioners voted to approve the family school support workers under their human services' budget. In 2010-11 the county voted to approve the Restorative Justice program under the Human Services' budget. The CHILD Network picked up offering parenting classes in 2010.

ATTACHMENT 2

GRANTEE PROJECT SUMMARY

Carver-Scott Educational Cooperative (CSEC)

Project Overview

The CSEC Project YES worked to change the manner in which academic and supportive services are provided to “Youth of Promise”. CSEC Project YES implemented a “Solution-Focused Intervention” (SFI) model to increase high school graduation, decrease juvenile delinquency and promote successful work and career transition for youth participants.

Over-time the plan is for other CSEC educational programs to phase in this intervention model. The solution-focused school culture is designed to offer educational strategies that help participating students change their beliefs and relationships, and learn principles inherent in the solution-building model. It is based on the understanding that elements of the desired solution are often already present in the client’s life, and can therefore become the basis for ongoing positive change. Several studies have shown the effectiveness of a solution-focused approach in working with at-risk youth in the school setting.

Target Population

CSEC students in grades 6 through 9 (ages 12-15) living in Carver and Scott Counties, who are at high risk for academic failure and juvenile delinquency. Criteria that place these “Youth of Promise” at risk include pattern of truancy, current involvement in juvenile justice system, academically behind, living in “out- of-home” placements, pregnant/parenting, substance abuse or recovery, or other significant risk factors.

Network Partners

- Carver-Scott Educational Cooperative.
- Carver County juvenile justice, mental health, and social service providers.
- Scott County juvenile justice, mental health, and social service providers
- Cross Generation, a human services agency, and others involved with youth and family.

Proposed Project Goals

Goal #1: Increase graduation rates for CSEC students from the current rate of 73 percent to 85 percent by the time cohort would normally complete 12th grade (2012).

Objective 1.1: 85 percent of youth participating in CSEC Project YES will improve their academic performance in one or more core academic areas after at least six months of program participation, as reported by indicators.

Objective 1.2: Create a classroom, school, and home environment that effectively improves youth’s functioning at home, school, and in the community after at least six months in the program.

Indicator 1A: Improved class attendance.

Indicator 1B: Improved grade-point average.

Indicator 1C: Current CSEC policies and procedures will align with solution-focused model.

Indicator 1D: Staff are trained on solution-focused model.

Indicator 1E: Parent or primary adult support person for youth participants will participate in at least one parent/family education session.

Goal #2 Decrease involvement in the juvenile justice system of school-aged youth who are disproportionately represented in the juvenile justice system.

Objective 2.1: Decrease recidivism rate of youth ages 12-15 years who are currently involved with the juvenile justice system by completion of the grant cycle.

Indicator 2A: Law enforcement and juvenile justice professionals are trained in motivational interviewing and the solution-focused model.

Indicator 2B: Carver and Scott county juvenile justice agencies collect and report on youth recidivism that is clear and consistent in both counties on a regular basis (at least annually).

Progress Toward Project YES Goals (see individual project reports for a full summary of outcome measures related to specific initiatives)

Decrease in contact with the juvenile justice system.

Juvenile recidivism defined by the counties; decreased over two years: Carver: 35 to 26 percent; Scott: 10 to 2 percent. Restorative justice conferences had 100% conference agreement completion.

Increased graduation rates.

Students in the program showed an 86 percent attendance improvement, 71percent GPA improvement. Professional Learning Community recruitment and participation target was exceeded. Twenty-five students participated in Youth at Promise mentoring/youth leadership each reporting period.

Systems change

SFI practiced by a cadre of teachers, probation officers, county social workers and police officers training in SFI; at the cooperative, there are five on-going Professional Learning Communities on SFI.

ATTACHMENT 3

GRANTEE PROJECT SUMMARY

Cass Lake-Bena Public Schools

Project Overview

The goal of Project YES in Cass Lake was to create a sustainable shared vision and team effort of Cass Lake Bena School District 115, Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe, Stellher Human Services, Rural Minnesota Concentrated Employment Program (CEP), and the Cass County human services, juvenile probation, and truancy professionals to provide at-risk disengaged youth with the support needed to become productive citizens and achieve economic self-sufficiency.

Project YES was designed to provide supplementary wraparound resources to target students participating in the YouthBuild (YB) initiative. Once students signed on to work with YouthBuild, they would have increased access to mental health, chemical health, and school support services through this network model.

Target Population

At-risk youth, ages 16-20, who have dropped out or failed to graduate from high school (including teen parents, youth involved with truancy and/or the juvenile justice system).

Network Partners

- Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe: Youth Services and Education Divisions; Housing Authority.
- Rural Minnesota CEP
- Cass County: Human Services, Juvenile Probation, Truancy.
- Stellher Human Services.
- North Country Vocational Cooperative.

Proposed Project Goals

Goal #1: Re-engage at-risk youth in education by providing the mental health and chemical dependency counseling support necessary for them to graduate and transition to postsecondary education, training, or employment.

Objective 1.1: Provide mental health/chemical dependency screening and ongoing counseling support for at-risk youth ages 16-20.

Indicator 1A: Student participation in mental health/CD screening and ongoing counseling support.

Indicator 1B: Student successful re-engagement in the educational system.

Goal #2 Re-engage at-risk youth in education by providing integrated academics, work-based and service-based learning opportunities which will not only lead to graduation but

also allow students to transition successfully to post-secondary education, training, or employment.

Objective 2.1: Academic curriculum integrated along with work-based and service-based learning to promote participant success.

Indicator 2A: Increased graduation rates.

Indicator 2B: Decreased repeat juvenile justice system offending.

Progress Toward Project YES Goals (see individual project reports for a full summary of outcome measures related to specific initiatives)

Decrease in contact with the juvenile justice system.

There was a decrease in re-offending. Over the two year, each six month reported indicated the percentage of participants on probation who did not reoffend 89 percent, 100 percent, 100 percent and 67 percent.

Increased graduation rates.

Over the three years, an average of 10 students participated in YES/YouthBuild. One student graduated, and 4 received their GED's. One student enrolled in Post Secondary Education Opportunity (PSEO) coursework at Leech Lake Tribal College. All students participated in CD screenings, and an average of 79 percent of the students accessed mental health counseling.

Systems change.

YES community partners continue to meet monthly to coordinate YouthBuild programming. Solution-Focused Interventions (SFI) training added to school district turn-around plan.

ATTACHMENT 4

GRANTEE PROJECT SUMMARY

Hennepin County/Minneapolis School District /Intermediate School District 287

Project Overview

The YES Hennepin Project was designed as a cross-systems planning and implementation project bringing together Minneapolis Public Schools, District 287, Hennepin County Children's Mental Health, Hennepin County Juvenile Probation, the University of Minnesota Department of Psychiatry, the Fairview-University Medical Center Chemical Dependency program, Power of Relationships, and additional community-based mental health and youth development providers to bring support services to their natural gathering point: the child's school.

The project targeted the highest need students throughout Hennepin County and focused on removing barriers and integrating services at the county level. Increased mental health, chemical dependency, youth and family case management and youth development opportunities were coordinated to help stabilize and empower youth to graduate from high school and avoid corrections involvement. Coordination of systems partnerships to serve all four schools included design of a school-linked services menu to support high-needs students and their families from kindergarten through the transition period (age 18-21).

Target Population

- Hennepin County residents attending a school within Hennepin County.
- Children/youth in grades K-12; transition age youth, 18-21, receiving special education services.
- Children/youth meeting special education criteria for EBD.
- Children/youth receiving Federal Setting III or IV special education services.

Network Partners

- *Education:* Minneapolis Public School, Intermediate District #287.
- *Children's Mental Health:* Hennepin County Children's Mental Health.
- *Corrections:* Hennepin County Juvenile Corrections.
- *Community Mental Health and Chemical Dependency Providers.*
- *Community Youth Development Service Providers.*

Proposed Project Goals

Goal #1: Decrease juvenile justice contact among Hennepin County students with emotional-behavioral disorders requiring Setting III or IV special education services.

Objective 1.1: Students will reduce their involvement in the corrections system through provision of school-based mental health, chemical health, and youth development resources.

Indicator 1A: Reduced number of probation violations.

Indicator 1B: Reduced number of students sent to correctional placement.

Goal #2 Increase high school graduation rates for Hennepin County students with emotional-behavioral disorders requiring Setting III or IV special education services.

Objective 2.1: Students graduate or make adequate yearly progress toward graduation.

Indicator 2A: Improved school attendance.

Indicator 2B: Reduced suspension rates.

Goal #3 Improve mental and chemical health status of Hennepin County students with emotional-behavioral disorders requiring Setting III or IV special education services.

Objective 3.1: More students receive effective, accessible, and sustainable chemical and mental health care.

Indicator 3A: Number of students being referred to co-located services by staff, parent/guardian request, or self-referral.

Indicator 3B: Number of students and families that access each service upon referral.

Progress Toward Project YES Goals (see individual project reports for a full summary of outcome measures related to specific initiatives)

Decrease in contact with the juvenile justice system.

Slight reduction in the number of probation violations.

Increased graduation rates.

Slight decrease in suspension and increase in school attendance.

Systems change.

Increase in the percentage of referrals and families accessing co-located and community referrals—approaching 99 percent. Improved communication between schools and probation; collaboration between University of Minnesota Mental Health Fellows, schools, probation, community mentoring programs and county mental health partners. Day-long conference was held to acquaint other district programs to learn of all the YES grantee's programming and outcomes.

Number of Youth Served by Race/Ethnicity and Age Per Each of Four Reporting Periods (October 2007-September 2009)

	Carlton				Carver-Scott				Cass				Hennepin			
	10/07-2/08	3/08-8/08	9/08-2/09	3/09-9/09	10/07-2/08	3/08-8/08	9/08-2/09	3/09-9/09	10/07-2/08	3/08-8/08	9/08-2/09	3/09-9/09	10/07-2/08	3/08-8/08	9/08-2/09	3/09-9/09
Race/Ethnicity of Participants																
Amer Indian/Alaskan Native	15	65	58	29	6	1	1	1	12	9	10	10	4	3	11	6
Asian	0	1	1	1		0		3					1	0	1	1
Black or African American	2	5	1	1	3	4	7	13					124	113	143	101
Hispanic or Latino	7	3	6	6	4	3	6	6					5	5	10	4
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander		0	0	1		0		0					0	0	0	0
White or European American	120	237	244	246	18	16	35	58					7	8	28	12
Mixed Race	10	3	4	1		2	6	3					0	0	0	0
Other		0	0	0		1	1						4	4	3	0
Unknown	7	0	9	10		25	24						0	0	0	13
Total	161	314	323	295	31	52	80	84	12	9	10	10	145	133	196	137
	Carlton				Carver-Scott				Cass				Hennepin			
	10/07-2/08	3/08-8/08	9/08-2/09	3/09-9/09	10/07-2/08	3/08-8/08	9/08-2/09	3/09-9/09	10/07-2/08	3/08-8/08	9/08-2/09	3/09-9/09	10/07-2/08	3/08-8/08	9/08-2/09	3/09-9/09
Age																
Under 5	35	35	37					0							0	
5-9	9	12	0					0					12	5	1	
10-14	40	86	96	84	3	11	19	15					31	13	57	1
15-18	101	207	219	203	25	27	56	60	9	5	7	7	102	112	130	106
19+	1	40	4	5	3		5	9	3	4	3	3	1	1	2	6
Unknown			4	3		14								2	6	22
Total	186	380	360	295	31	52	80	84	12	9	10	10	146	133	196	135
	Carlton				Carver-Scott				Cass				Hennepin			
	10/07-2/08	3/08-8/08	9/08-2/09	3/09-9/09	10/07-2/08	3/08-8/08	9/08-2/09	3/09-9/09	10/07-2/08	3/08-8/08	9/08-2/09	3/09-9/09	10/07-2/08	3/08-8/08	9/08-2/09	3/09-9/09
Gender																
Female	55	129	117	100	19	20	32	35	4	2	6	6	22	17	30	22
Male	96	185	206	195	12	32	48	49	8	7	4	4	124	116	166	115
Total	151	314	323	295	31	52	80	84	12		10	10	146	133	196	137
TOTAL NUMBER SERVED (Total Number of Unduplicated Participants per reporting period)	186	314	323	295	31	52	80	84	12	9	10	10	146	133	196	137

Percent of Youth Served by Targeted Population

	Carlton				Carver-Scott				Cass				Hennepin			
	10/07-2/08	3/08-8/08	9/08-2/09	3/09-9/09	10/07-2/08	3/08-8/08	9/08-2/09	3/09-9/09	10/07-2/08	3/08-8/08	9/08-2/09	3/09-9/09	10/07-2/08	3/08-8/08	9/08-2/09	3/09-9/09
Percent English Language Learners ²	0.5	0.3	0.3	0.3	13	12 (est)	14	10	0	0			4	4	3	1
Percent low income ¹	46	25	39	35	71	44	51	50	58	56	90	90	90	98	82	
Percent who are truant	29	36	31	31		12				0			21	23		
Percent at risk of being truant	35	89			61	79				0			9	10		
Percent who have dropped out of school	1	1	3	5		12			58	56	80	80	U	U		
Percent at risk of dropping out of school	30	26			48	46				44			U	U		
Runaway youth				2											U	U
Homeless youth		0.6	3	2			4	4 (est)							9	8
Pregnant or parenting youth		4	5	5			8	7 (est)	33	22	50	50				
Percent in contact with juvenile justice system	16	16	15	12	32	31		4	58	67	40	40	74	83		

1=eligible for free or reduced-price lunch.

2=participants who speak a primary language other than English at home or are Limited English Proficient.

U=unknown.

Percentages calculated using total number of unduplicated participants; rounded to nearest whole percent.