II. Introduction

A. Overview of Project

Maryland is promoting systems change to improve the way in which prevention and youth programs are strategically planned, funded, and delivered. Last year Maryland embarked upon two distinct but related efforts. The first was aimed at developing and implementing a statewide prevention strategy. The second, the Youth Strategies Consolidated Grant, combined multiple funding streams to empower communities to coordinate services and programs for children and youth into a research-based, data-driven continuum of care.

The Governor’s Office of Crime Control and Prevention (GOCCP) contracted with the University of Maryland’s Center for Substance Abuse Research (CESAR) and the Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice to evaluate both of these efforts. CESAR was tasked with evaluating systems change at the state and local levels. The University’s Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice was asked to conduct an outcome evaluation of programs supported by the Youth Strategies Consolidated Grant and to produce a manual of effective, prevention-related, research-based programs.

This report is the first in a series in which CESAR will present findings from its evaluation of systems change at the state and local levels. Descriptive baseline data from FY 2001 and more current data from FY 2002 are the focus of this report.

We begin by describing the State prevention strategy and the Youth Strategies Consolidated Grant. Within each effort we will describe CESAR’s first year evaluation activities, followed by key findings and conclusions.

B. The State Prevention Strategy

The State prevention strategy is overseen by the Maryland Partnership and the State Advisory Board for Juvenile Justice. An Executive Order signed by the Governor re-constituted the State Advisory Board on Juvenile Justice and established four standing committees. The Community Based Prevention, Early Intervention and Family Support committee was charged with overseeing the development of a prevention plan. Thus far, meetings have been convened for the purpose of having key State agencies develop and implement an interagency statewide prevention strategy. The overall vision for this statewide initiative is ensuring that children are healthy and safe in their families and communities. The strategy addresses sixteen areas of prevention, as measured by the target indicators of Maryland’s Results for Child Well-Being.

Two questions were initially addressed by CESAR’s year-one evaluation:

1. Did the State produce a comprehensive, interagency, statewide strategic plan for prevention?
2. Did the State implement that plan?

In order to begin to answer these questions, CESAR conducted baseline interviews with representatives of eight State agencies regarding the State system of prevention that existed in Fiscal Year 2001, prior to the initiation of the State prevention strategy. Supporting documentation was reviewed. In addition, CESAR observed all 20 State-level prevention meetings since July 2001 (Fiscal Year 2002) and documented the progress that was made toward crafting a State prevention strategy.

C. The Youth Strategies Consolidated Grant

The Youth Strategies Consolidated Grant effort began in 2001. GOCCP consolidated eight grants covering substance abuse and juvenile delinquency prevention, early intervention, and intervention, and community-based interventions for youths in the juvenile justice system into one grant. The purpose of this effort was to build local capacity to coordinate fragmented services and programs for children and youth into a research-based, data-driven continuum of care. Funding and oversight for the Youth Strategies Consolidated Grant are provided by the State Advisory Board on Juvenile Justice through GOCCP.

To apply for a Youth Strategies Consolidated Grants, Local Management Boards were mandated to collaborate with five local partners from various local child- and youth-serving public agencies. The mandated partners are: Prevention Coordinators, Safe and Drug Free Schools Coordinators, HotSpot Lead Coordinators, Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) Representatives, and Local Law Enforcement Representatives. These team members were expected to work together to plan for, support, and provide oversight for the local implementation of the grant.

The Youth Strategies Consolidated Grant combines seven federal grants and one state grant. The grants that were consolidated and their sources of funding are:

- State Incentive Grant (SIG) – Center for Substance Abuse Prevention (CSAP)
- Enforcing Underage Drinking Laws Grant/ Combating Underage Drinking – Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP)
- Maryland Afterschool Program Initiative – U.S. Department of Education (DOE)
- Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities-Governor’s Portion – DOE
- Title V – OJJDP
- Formula Grant - OJJDP
- Maryland Community Capacity Building – DJJ
- Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant – OJJDP.

Two major questions regarding the Youth Strategies Consolidated Grant were initially addressed by CESAR’s year-one evaluation:

1. What impact did the Youth Strategies Consolidated Grant have on systems change at the local level?
More specifically:

- Were collaborations among agency partners strengthened?
- Were community stakeholders involved?
- Were agency partners thinking in terms of a coordinated continuum of youth services?
- Were services community-focused?
- Were services research-based?
- Was there adequate capacity to sustain change?

2. What factors and activities encouraged and discouraged the systems change that occurred?

To begin to answer these questions, CESAR staff reviewed available documents, including the Guidance and Application Kit for the Youth Strategies Consolidated Grant. CESAR staff interviewed the 24 Local Management Board (LMB) directors and 122 mandated partners of the local planning committees. These interviews collected baseline information about roles, collaborations, and training for the period prior to the Youth Strategies Consolidated Grant, Fiscal Year 2001. Interviewers also asked these respondents about their experiences and opinions regarding the planning stage in the latter half of 2001 that led to the writing of grant applications for the Youth Strategies Consolidated Grant. The LMB directors were asked additional questions to examine their history and capacity for local coordination and collaboration.

This report is organized as follows: Section III presents a brief summary of the methodology. Section IV reports on the baseline findings of the State prevention strategy. These findings are broken into two subsections – the State prevention meetings and the State agency interview baseline findings. Section V reports on the consolidation of the Youth Strategies Consolidation Grant and the baseline findings of the Local Management Boards and the planning committees.

---

4 In the report, the term planning committee members refers to the LMB directors and mandated partners (Prevention Coordinators, Law Enforcement Representatives, Juvenile Justice Representatives, Safe and Drug Free School Coordinators, and HotSpots Lead Coordinators).
III. Methodology

A. Sampling and Response Rates

There were two separate data collection efforts: for the State prevention strategy and for the local Youth Strategies Consolidation Grant.

1. The State prevention strategy

The target population for the State data collection effort was representatives of State agencies who were invited by the State to participate in a prevention workgroup. These representatives were considered to be the prevention authorities within their respective agencies.5

The sampling frame was a list of eight names and telephone numbers of the representatives from the State-level agencies or units of agencies.6

Since the goal of this data collection effort was to obtain interviews with everyone from the target population, no sampling procedures were employed. Instead, a complete sampling frame was used as a sample. A total of eight interviews were obtained, yielding a response rate of 100% for the State prevention strategy data collection effort.

2. The Youth Strategies Consolidated Grant

The target population for the local Youth Strategies Consolidation Grant initiative was the Local Management Board directors and coordinators/representatives, who had been mandated to be on youth strategies planning committees. A planning committee exists in every Maryland county and in Baltimore City and is supposed to include: (1) Local Management Board (LMB) directors; (2) local agency coordinators/representatives (Prevention Coordinators, HotSpot Lead Coordinators, Safe and Drug Free Schools Coordinators, DJJ Representatives, and Local Law Enforcement Representatives).

5 The prevention workgroup was a subcommittee whose main mission was to develop a State prevention plan. The workgroup eventually disbanded and was replaced by three implementation committees, but the representatives who were initially invited to participate in the workgroup were also invited to participate in the new committees. (The prevention workgroup is further explained in section IV-B.)

6 State agencies refer to State cabinet level agencies, units of these agencies, and Governor’s offices. For the sake of brevity, the term agencies will be used in the report instead of agencies and agency units. The eight agencies were: (1) Alcohol and Drug Abuse Administration (ADAA), Department of Health and Mental Hygiene (DHMH); (2) Center of Health Promotion, Education, and Tobacco Use Prevention, DHMH; (3) Mental Hygiene Administration (MHA), DHMH; (4) Social Services Administration, Department of Human Resources (DHR); (5) Community Resource Development, Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ); (6) Safe and Drug Free Schools Program (SDFS), Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE); (7) Combating Underage Drinking and Youth Strategies Grants Units, the Governor’s Office of Crime Control and Prevention (GOCCP); and (8) Governor’s Council on Adolescent Pregnancy, Governor’s Office for Children, Youth, and Families (OCYF).
The sampling frame for the local Youth Strategies Consolidated Grant initiative data collection effort was compiled from various sources, such as state agencies or Web sites, and consisted of the names and contact information of the youth strategies planning committee members. Except when multiple HotSpot Lead Coordinators existed, one coordinator of each type was expected to be interviewed per planning committee. Since the exact number of the eligible respondents is unknown, the sampling frame is best described in terms of the 144 possible positions (6 planning committee members x 24 jurisdictions).

A total of 146 completed interviews were obtained, representing 131 out of 144 possible positions (Table 3.1). Thus, an overall response rate for the local youth data collection effort was 91%.

### Table 3.1
**Sample Disposition and Response Rates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County*</th>
<th>LMB Director</th>
<th>Prevention Coordinator</th>
<th>Juvenile Justice</th>
<th>Hot Spots**</th>
<th>SDFS</th>
<th>Law Enforcement</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (Response Rate)</strong></td>
<td>24 (100%)</td>
<td>24 (100%)</td>
<td>23 (96%)</td>
<td>23 (96%)</td>
<td>23 (96%)</td>
<td>14 (58%)</td>
<td>131 (91%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Counties are not in alphabetical order.
** In six counties more than one HotSpots person was interviewed.
Note: A total of 146 persons were interviewed. In cases where a mandated coordinator/representative did not attend the planning committee a representative from that agency was eligible to be interviewed for baseline questions about the agency.

---

The list pertaining to the Local Law Enforcement Representatives was compiled during the data collection effort based on the information provided by the Local Management Board directors and other members of the planning committees.
B. Questionnaire Development and Data Collection

Three standardized interview instruments were developed: State Agency Survey (Appendix A), Coordinator Survey (Appendix B), and Local Management Board Director Survey (Appendix C). All three instruments were reviewed by the youth strategies unit director at GOCCP and her State Incentive Grant (SIG) manager prior to pretesting. The youth strategies director was a former LMB director and her SIG manager was a former Prevention Coordinator and active LMB committee member. The instruments were approved for use along with a consent form (Appendix D) by the Institutional Review Board of the University of Maryland. Participation in the interviews was voluntary; all respondents had to sign a consent form.


All of the State prevention strategies interviews, all but one of the LMB director interviews, and approximately half of the coordinator/representative interviews were conducted in person; the rest were administered by telephone. When respondents were not available for interviews during scheduled area visits, telephone interviews were used instead. In rare instances, unfinished interviews were completed via e-mail.

The two local level instruments were pretested in the field during the first five counties’ data collection and revised accordingly. The small number of State-level representatives made a formal pretest impractical.

The average interview length was 2.5 hours for the State survey and the LMB director survey and 1.25 hours for the coordinator survey. In addition to being asked open-ended and close-ended standardized questions, State interviewees and LMB directors were asked to provide supporting documentation, such as annual reports, evaluation reports, examples of training materials, program descriptions, and membership lists.

Two trained evaluation interview staff conducted all interviews. Training consisted of many ongoing discussions, a written protocol, supervised trial interviews, and an article on proper interviewing techniques. Throughout data collection, the senior interviewer checked and supervised the other interviewer’s work to ensure data quality.

After data collection, forms were checked for completeness, data were double entered by trained data entry personnel using a pre-programmed SPSS data entry module, and data were checked for out-of-range errors and logical inconsistencies. Quantitative coding schemes were developed for the open-ended data and these data were entered into SPSS.
C. Attending State-Level Prevention Meetings

A final method of data collection consisted of observations of all 20 State-level prevention meetings since July 2001. Extensive notes were taken at these meetings. A form was used to capture this information in a standardized manner.