**Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency (PCCD)**

**Grantee Outcomes Report Template**

**Aggression Replacement Training®**

As a requirement of funding under PCCD’s Research-based Programs Initiative, all grantees are **required to submit a cumulative outcomes report. Grantees should submit this report in the 3rd quarter of the 2nd year of funding.**

The purpose of the Outcomes Report is to convey the experience of the grantee in implementing the program, and to summarize the program’s reach, implementation quality, and impact. Preparing the Outcomes Report is intended to be a reflective process and can also serve as a valuable tool to the grantee for communicating the program’s impact to local stakeholders.

**It is recommended that prior to completing the report, grantees print copies of their grant application, quarterly E-grants reports, excel spreadsheet PM reporting tool(s), and other program data. These resources should be used to respond in narrative format to all of the outcome report questions. Please answer using complete sentences.**

**Please only report on data that is reflective of participants and services funded by PCCD. If multiple grants have been funded, separate outcome reports are required for each grant.**

A document providing guidance on how to complete the report for your specific program can be accessed on the EPISCenter website at: www.episcenter.psu.edu. Please contact **your assigned EPISCenter Prevention Coordinator** by phone at 814-863-2568 if assistance is needed. **You are strongly encouraged to submit your draft report to your assigned EPISCenter Prevention Coordinator for feedback prior to submitting the report to PCCD**. The final report should be attached in E-grants with your quarterly report in the 3rd quarter of year 2.

Person Completing the Report (name, phone, & email):

Grant ID #:

Grantee’s Name:

Evidence-based Program Implemented:

Grant Start Date:

Report Completion Date:

Geographic Location (County/School(s) Served):

Describe any major changes to the project plan from what was originally proposed, and why those changes were necessary. If a Project Modification Request (PMR) was submitted, please explain. You may simply copy and paste the description and justification from the PMR from Egrants as your description here.

At the time of writing a grant application, it is impossible to foresee all the influences that may lead to implementation barriers and challenges. These challenges, such as delays in hiring, training or difficulty recruiting, can lead to changes to the envisioned project plan. Discuss challenges you encountered and any resulting changes to your originally proposed implementation.

INSERT AGENCY LOGO

**Aggression Replacement Training® OUTCOMES SUMMARY**

*In 2011, funds were awarded from the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency for two years of program implementation. This report summarizes the results through* ***(indicate data timeline).***

*\* Completion is defined as youth attending at least 28 out of 30 sessions.*

**Description of Population Served:**

**Additional Participants to be served by the Grant’s End:** Number of youth you will serve with the funds from this grant that is not included in this report?

**Population Characteristics:** Race, Gender Ratio, Socioeconomic status. Please describe any information you have regarding the target population of your youth.

**Description of the Targeted Risk and Protective Factors:**

*Describe the risk and protective factors that the community planned to address using ART®.*

**MODEL FIDELITY PROCESS:** There are there major components of the ART® fidelity process. First is facilitator proficiency certification. Second is to have a person trained in the ART® curriculum to observe 20% of the sessions facilitated to assess model fidelity. And third, a Quality Assurance Review conducted by an ART® master trainer after the first full year of implementation. Each process provides important information about the quality of program implementation.

**Areas of Strength:** Briefly describe the strengths identified during the observations and Quality Assurance Review.

**Areas for Improvement:** Briefly describe any areas for improvement during the observations and Quality Assurance Review and how they have been addressed.

**ART® Youth Outcomes**

**ART® Pre/Post Survey Administration:**  The data shown below was collected using the SkillStreaming Checklist, Aggression Questionnaire, and How I Think Questionnaire. These three assessments are used to establish baseline data before youth begin the ART® curriculum and after the program to determine change.
The tool assesses changes in attitudes, skills, and behaviors.

**Total Number of Participants Surveyed:** Enter the number of youth surveyed out of the number of youth served. For example: **91 youth out of 100 served completed pre/post surveys, or 91% completed the pre/post surveys.**

**What is the expected long-term impact of ART®?**  The outcomes highlighted above reflect short-term participant changes. These changes are expected to lead to long-term outcomes similar to those demonstrated in ART® trials.

**Potential Long Term Impacts of ART® Shown in Research**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * Up to 24% reduction in 18-month misdemeanor and felony recidivism rates, when implemented with high model fidelity.
 | * Improvements in community functioning
* Improved pro-social skills
* Decrease in conduct behaviors
 |

**What is the Cost Benefit of ART®?**  The Washington State Institute for Public Policy reports that for every dollar invested in ART® there is a potential savings of up to $41.75 or $61,440 for every youth who participates. For more information about the WISPP report and how these costs are calculated go to <http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/>.

**With 100 youth being served the savings to Pennsylvania is potentially $** **6,144,000.**

(this number will need to be calculated given the # of youth served by your organization)

**SECTION 1 – DESCRIPTION OF POPULATION SERVED**

1. Please explain if you are serving or expect to serve the number of participants targeted in your grant application (why or why not). Refer to the chart listing your original target and the total number served as well as any youth you plan to serve before the end of the grant.
2. If applicable, describe your recruitment and referral process for the program:

List your referral sources:

Explain any barriers to recruitment or referrals:

1. Please explain whether or not you implemented the program as designed and with the indicated dosage (i.e. hours of service, number of lessons delivered, number of mentoring hours, number of sessions outlined by the developer):

Referring to the chart of participant attendance, please provide an explanation for participants not receiving the full dosage:

**SECTION 2 - INDICATORS OF PROGRAM IMPACT**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Total Number of Participants:** | **Number of Participants Surveyed:** | **Percentage of Participants Surveyed:** |
|  |  |  |

1. Explain any challenges you encountered in collecting or analyzing survey data. Include an explanation for the percentage of participants not surveyed:
2. Explain any factors that you feel may have influenced the outcomes data results:
3. Indicate the baseline community level indicators that led to the selection of your program (i.e., PAYS data, child abuse rates, juvenile court or probation statistics, school dropout rates, etc.).

State your plan for tracking long-term change in community level indicators:

**SECTION 3 – INDICATORS OF IMPLEMENTATION QUALITY AND FIDELITY**

1. Explain anybarriers to the fidelity assessment process that were encountered and how you did or plan to overcome them:

*Note: Please include any changes made to the assessment process during the grant cycle in your response.*

1. Describe specific processes for providing assessment results or feedback to implementers to support continuous quality improvement: In addition to providing feedback to implementers following observations, did implementers have a chance to discuss program quality with each other?
2. Indicate any areas of strength in implementation quality or fidelity that were identified from reviewing your fidelity data or during the Quality Assurance Process: Were the strengths identified by the developer similar to your own “self-identified” strengths?
3. Indicate any challenges in implementation quality or fidelity that were identified when reviewing your fidelity data or during the Quality Assurance Process:

Explain any changes you made throughout the grant cycle to your implementation in response to the challenges identified:

**SECTION 4 - LESSONS LEARNED**

1. Describe anything you would have done differently during grant planning or implementation to improve the program’s coordination, delivery, or effectiveness:
2. What lessons have you learned that would benefit other communities who are considering implementing this program:
	1. Was there sufficient buy in from referral sources before implementation began?
	2. What type of support was garnered from the community?
	3. Is there anything related to training that was or could have been helpful?
	4. Did you assess whether youth and volunteers felt supported and satisfied with the program?
	5. Did you develop processes for collecting and monitoring dosage data?
	6. How did you communicate outcomes to your community stakeholders?
3. Please describe any ways in which you exceeded the expectations of the project as proposed or realized additional benefits for your community:

**SECTION 5 - PROGRAM SUSTAINABILITY**

1. Explain the specific planning steps have you taken to sustain the program beyond PCCD funding (e.g., detailing the budget, meeting with stakeholders, securing local investment, applying for additional grants):
2. If you have applied for or secured additional funding from any source to support the program, please list the source(s) and the status of any pending application(s):

***THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME!***