Cases should be nominated by agency representatives on the basis of the representatives' determination on (a) documented risk factors through LAP assessment score, (b) frequency of agency contact with the victim, (c) special attention to homicides or attempted homicides, (d) other factors that illustrate risk or barriers to effective intervention.

   ii. **How will it choose which cases to review?**
   Prior to each meeting of the HRDVI, the HRDVI Coordinator will contact representatives of each agency and solicit recommendations for cases for review. Each representative will recommend at least one and no more than two cases for review per meeting.

   iii. **How will it ensure the confidentiality of victims' personally-identifying information during the review?**

   Victim/survivor confidentiality is of the utmost importance, and the agencies represented in this team are well-versed in the protection of victim information. In the event that a case nominated for review does not include a Release of Information from a victim for the agencies represented, or for the HRDVIT as a whole, the review team can conduct its review in two stages--first reviewing non-confidential events and factors in the case as a whole, and then excusing representatives who have not been granted a Release for any remaining review where victim-disclosed personally identifiable required for a successful intervention.

c. **How will it communicate its recommendations to the Council and domestic violence stakeholders?**

   As part of the case review process, the HRDVIT Coordinator will record key elements of discussion and any findings, suggestions, or follow-up questions on each case. These will be disseminated to the HRDVIT after each meeting. Agency representatives will be responsible for recording, disseminating, and implementing any follow-up actions or interventions identified for current cases during the review.

d. **How often does it meet, and how often has it met to date?**

   Currently, the HRDVIT meets every other month, but is exploring meeting more frequently to better respond to high-risk cases.

41. Please provide an update on the Crisis Continuum Project.
   The Crisis Continuum Project (CCP), a collaborative project between MedStar Washington Hospital Center Trauma Department and Emergency Department, DC Forensic Nurse Examiners, Network for Victim Recovery of DC, DC SAFE, and the Wendt Center for Loss and Healing launched in April 2016. The goal of the project is to provide on-site medical forensic care and on-call victim advocacy to victims of attempted homicide and family of homicide victims who report through MedStar Washington Hospital Center.

a. **Please discuss funding allocated for the Crisis Continuum Project in FY16 and FY17, to date.**

In FY16, OVSJG expended $956,556.81 for the CCP. In FY17, we have (or are in the process of awarding, $1,477,331 to the original four partners and the addition of Prince George's Hospital Center, Howard University Hospital, and Community Connections.

b. **Please provide the number and type of victims that have been served on a monthly basis, including the services provided.**

Grantees report data on a quarterly basis:
- April – June 2016: 107 victims received medical forensic care
- July – September 2016: 75 victims received medical forensic care, 147 victims received crisis intervention services
- October – December 2016: 70 victims received medical forensic care, 159 victim received crisis intervention services

c. **Are there any plans for expansion of the project in FY18?**

In FY17 we added Prince George's Hospital Center, Howard University Hospital, and Community Connections as additional partners in the project. Further expansion in FY18 is dependent on availability of funding.

42. **Please provide an update on the Private Security Camera System Incentive Program.**
    a. **How many rebates have been issued in FY16 and FY17, to date, by Police Service Area ("PSA")?**

FY16 rebates issued in each PSA:

PSA	Rebates Issued	PSA	Rebates Issued	PSA	Rebates Issued	PSA	Rebates Issued
101	0	207	1	405	23	603	14
102	0	208	4	406	10	604	4
103	0	301	1	407	34	605	3
104	49	302	34	408	4	606	9
105	5	303	8	409	26	607	6
106	28	304	5	501	61	608	10
107	50	305	13	502	73	701	17
108	67	306	3	503	39	702	4
201	3	307	5	504	45	703	3
202	20	308	10	505	10	704	7
203	1	401	4	506	24	705	8
204	2	402	12	507	47	706	2
205	0	403	32	601	6	707	5
206	0	404	41	602	7	708	6

FY17 rebates issued in each PSA, as of January 31, 2017:

PSA	Rebates Issued	PSA	Rebates Issued	PSA	Rebates Issued	PSA	Rebates Issued
101	0	207	2	405	15	603	2
102	0	208	5	406	4	604	4
103	1	301	8	407	32	605	8
104	38	302	12	408	9	606	4
105	2	303	6	409	15	607	3
106	18	304	9	501	47	608	6
107	32	305	9	502	36	701	10
108	40	306	2	503	28	702	0
201	9	307	6	504	23	703	2
202	16	308	6	505	4	704	2
203	5	401	6	506	16	705	0
204	7	402	18	507	30	706	1
205	17	403	19	601	5	707	2
206	8	404	34	602	7	708	1

b. How many private security cameras were funded in FY16 and FY17, to date?

In FY16, 2,530 cameras were and 1,642 have been funded in FY17, as of January 31.

c. How many rebates and vouchers were issued in priority areas in FY16 and FY17, to date?

In FY16, 864 rebates were issued in priority areas and 554 rebates have been issued in priority areas in FY17, as of January 31. There have been no vouchers issued.

d. How many rebates were issued to residents, businesses, nonprofits, and religious institutions in FY16 and FY17, to date?

Property Type	FY16 Rebates	FY17 Rebates as of 1/31/17
Resident	942	532
Business	42	15
Non-Profit	13	4
Religious Institution	5	3

e. Are there any plans for expansion of this program in FY18?

There are no current plans for the expansion of this program in FY18.

Funding Agency: FO
As Of Date: 1/31/2017
Appropriation Year: 17

Title	Program	Salary	Fringe	Original Hire Date	Time in Agency	Reg/Temp/Term
Director, Justice Grants Admin	AMP	126,690.00	24,071.10	12/21/2015	1yr/1mo	Reg
Administrative Officer	AMP	117,267.00	21,861.00	3/10/2002	14yrs/10mos	Reg
Grants Management Specialist	JG	114,199.00	21,697.81	11/21/2011	5yrs/2mos	Term
Grants Management Specialist	VS	104,423.00	19,840.37	7/28/2014	2yrs/7mos	Reg
Grants Management Specialist	VS	101,927.00	19,366.13	2/20/2007	9yrs/11mos	Reg
Grants Management Specialist	VS	101,927.00	19,366.13	4/13/2009	7yrs/9mos	Reg
Grants Program Specialist	JG	96,632.00	18,630.08	10/20/2014	2yr/2mos	Term
Special Assistant	JG	95,481.00	18,141.39	2/2/2015	1yr/11mos	Reg
Grants Management Specialist	JG	86,244.00	16,386.36	1/28/2002	5yrs/5mos	Reg
Grants Management Specialist	JG	81,050.00	15,399.50	9/8/2015	1yr/4mos	Reg
Victim Svcs Program Specialist	VS	81,050.00	15,399.50	7/13/2015	1yr/6mos	Reg
Grants Management Specialist	JG	70,345.00	13,365.55	10/28/2013	3yrs/3mos	Reg
Staff Assistant	VS/JG	67,814.00	14,240.94	10/28/2013	1mo	Term

Vacant Position Number	Title	Grade	Salary	Fringe	Program No.	Activity No.	Status	Federal/Local Law Mandated
46584	Deputy Director for Victim Services	14 MSS	119,591.00	22,722.14	4010	4000	Interviewing	No
90685	Grants Management Specialist	13	81,050.00	15,399.50	4010	4000	To be posted	No

Office of Victim Services and Justice Grants FY2016

Agency Office of Victim Services and Justice Grants   **Agency Acronym** OVSJG

Fiscal Year 2016

▼ 2016 Objectives

Strategic Objectives: What we want to do for the District

Division/Department	Objective Number	Objective Description
Access to Justice Initiative (1 Objective)		
Access to Justice Initiative	1	Provide direct civil legal services to low-income and underserved District residents.
Justice Grants Administration (1 Objective)		
Justice Grants Administration	5	Coordinate programs to deter criminal activity and enhance responses to crime
Justice Grants Administration (4 Objectives)		
Justice Grants Administration	1	Improve performance management and program development
Justice Grants Administration	2	Improve administration of federal grants
Justice Grants Administration	3	Provide leadership and financial support to allied District agencies to improve the administration of justice within the District of Columbia.
Justice Grants Administration	4	Reduce truancy in the District of Columbia Public Schools.
Office of Victim Services (2 Objectives)		
Office of Victim Services	1	Create and sustain a coordinated community response to all victims of violent crime that is sensitive, respectful, age appropriate and culturally competent
Office of Victim Services	2	Maintain respectful, articulate, and productive relationships with all partnering agencies and organizations to improve services to crime victims.

▼

2016 Key Performance Indicators

Performance Plan Measures (FY16 KPIs) Linked to Specific Objective	Performance Plan Metrics	Division	Frequency of Reporting	Measure	Current Fiscal Year Target	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016		
	1 - Create and sustain a coordinated community response to all victims of violent crime that is sensitive, respectful, age appropriate and culturally competent (11 Measures)										
	Key Performance Indicator		Quarterly	Number of advanced academies held	4	0	0	4	3		
	Key Performance Indicator		Quarterly	Number of victim service providers trained through the advanced academies	100	0	0	0	40		
	Key Performance Indicator		Quarterly	Percentage of DC SANE patients who received on-call advocacy at the sexual assault medical forensic exam	100	0	99		97.6%		
	Key Performance Indicator		Quarterly	Number of SART meetings staffed and attended	10	0	10	10	11		
	Key Performance Indicator		Annually	Number of DC agencies provided funding to enhance sexual assault services	4	0	3	4	4		
			Quarterly	Percentage of clients who	30	0	30		42.2%		

Performance Plan Metrics	Division	Frequency of Reporting	Measure	Current Fiscal Year Target	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
Key Performance Indicator			were assessed as polyvictims through the polyctimization assessment process					
Key Performance Indicator		Annually	Percentage of clients who were assessed as polyvictims and entered the PRT	60	0	64		47%
Key Performance Indicator		Quarterly	Number of language access plans developed by community-based victim service providers	10	0	0	17	29
Key Performance Indicator		Quarterly	Number of toolkits developed for DC-based campuses	4	0	0	0	2
Key Performance Indicator		Quarterly	Number of community-based victim service providers with translated material	20	0	0	17	26
Key Performance Indicator		Quarterly	Number of calls for service to the Emergency and Victim Services Interpreter Bank	100	0	0	811	1494

1 - Improve performance management and program development (7 Measures)

Performance Plan Metrics	Division	Frequency of Reporting	Measure	Current Fiscal Year Target	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
Key Performance Indicator		Annually	Number of baseline indicators established for sub-grantess that are consistent with OJP requirements	10	8	10	12	9
Key Performance Indicator		Annually	Percentage of sub-grantees participating in data collection	100	100	100	100	100%
Key Performance Indicator		Annually	Percentage of sub-grantees participating in process evaluation	80	35	50		100%
Key Performance Indicator		Annually	Percentage of data submitted by sub-grantees that meets the OJP Requirements	100	100	100		100%
Key Performance Indicator		Quarterly	Number of partnerships between sub-grantees, facilitated by JGA	8	5	7	8	8
Key Performance Indicator		Quarterly	Number of technical assistance sessions provided to sub-grantees	3	2	3	3	13
Key Performance Indicator		Quarterly	Number of meetings conducted with sub-grantees	4	2	4	4	17

1 - Provide direct civil legal services to low-income and underserved District residents. (3 Measures)

Performance Plan Metrics	Division	Frequency of Reporting	Measure	Current Fiscal Year Target	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
Key Performance Indicator		Annually	Percentage of data submitted by sub-grantees that meets the	100	100	100		100%

Performance Plan Metrics	Division	Frequency of Reporting	Measure	Current Fiscal Year Target	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016		
			OJP requirements							
Key Performance Indicator		Annually	Number of sub grants to organizations providing legal services to low income and underserved District residents	22	18	9	25	28		
Key Performance Indicator		Annually	Number of loans provided to legal services attorneys that assist low income and underserved District residents	25	18	20	20	35		
2 - Improve administration of federal grants (4 Measures)										
Key Performance Indicator		Quarterly	Number of Advisory Board meetings held each year.	14	12	14	14	7		
Key Performance Indicator		Annually	Number of three year strategic plans completed and approved by OJP	2	2	3	3	3		
Key Performance Indicator		Annually	Number of Annual Reports published and distrubuted to stakeholders	1	1	1	1	1		
Key Performance Indicator		Annually	Percentage of site visits completed and sub-grantees monitored for compliance	70	50	75		59.5%		
2 - Maintain respectful, articulate, and productive relationships with all partnering agencies and organizations to improve services to crime victims. (2 Measures)										
Key Performance Indicator		Quarterly	Number of SAVRAA Task Force Meetings staffed	4	0	0	4	4		
Key Performance Indicator		Quarterly	Number of Victim Assistance Network (VAN) meetings held and staffed	12	0	7	12	17		
3 - Provide leadership and financial support to allied District agencies to improve the administration of justice within the District of Columbia. (1 Measure)										
Key Performance Indicator		Quarterly	Number of Meetings held with Stakeholders to improve SORNA and PREA Initiatives	4	0	2	4	3		
4 - Reduce truancy in the District of Columbia Public Schools. (2 Measures)										
Key Performance Indicator		Quarterly	Number of collaborations established between community-based organizations and identified DCPS & PCS.	10	5	11	10	80		
Key Performance Indicator		Annually	Number of schools in which baseline truancy data was determined	40	17	37	57	67		

FY16 OVSJG Performance Plan

▼ 2016 Workload Measures

Performance Plan Metrics	Frequency of Reporting	Measure		FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY2016 Annual Total	
Workload Measure (11 Measures)								
Workload Measure	Annually	Number of District agencies who are funded in whole or part by JG		8	8	8	6	
Workload Measure	Quarterly	Number of community-based organizations funded in whole or in part by JG		22	32	30	37	
Workload Measure	Annually	Number of grants funded by federal funding sources		68	42	30	46	
Workload Measure	Quarterly	Number of grants funded by local funding sources		35	69	50	66	
Workload Measure	Quarterly	Number of new initiatives or collaborations developed or established		5	8	7	7	
Workload Measure	Annually	Number of District agencies who are funded in whole or part by OVS		4	5	5	6	
Workload Measure	Quarterly	Number of community-based organizations or individuals that are funded in whole or in part by OVS		25	32	30	53	
Workload Measure	Quarterly	Number of medical forensic evaluations performed			413	451	460	
Workload Measure	Quarterly	Number of victims served by the victim services hotline.					435	
Workload Measure	Quarterly	Number of victims of attempted homicide or homicide that receive medical forensic care through OVSJG funded programs.					156	
Workload Measure	Quarterly	Number of IPV victims that received medical forensic care.					151	

▼ 2016 Initiatives

Initiative Number	Initiative Title	Initiative Description	
Access to Justice Initiative - 1 (1 Initiative)			
1.1	Provide financial assistance to organizations and individuals who provide direct civil legal services to low-income and under-served District residents.	In FY12, Access to Justice Funds was awarded to 21 organizations that provide direct civil legal services to low-income and under-served District residents. Six lawyers who live and work in the District received educational loan repayment assistance in FY12 in the areas of legal practice that serve low-income residents. In FY 2013, grants will be awarded to organizations so that low-income and under-served District residents can receive direct civil legal services and loans will be made to lawyers to assist them in educational loan repayment. Completion date: September 30, 2013.	
Justice Grants Administration - 5 (1 Initiative)			
5.1	Develop and implement the Private Security Camera Incentive Program to provide rebates and vouchers for the purchase and installation of private security cameras.	The Private Security Camera Incentive Program, administered by the Office of Victim Services and Justice Grants provides rebates for residents, businesses, nonprofits, and religious institutions and vouchers for residents for the purchase and installation of a security camera system on their property and register them with the Metropolitan Police Department (MPD). This program is intended to help deter crime and assist law enforcement with investigations.	
Justice Grants Administration - 1 (1 Initiative)			
1.1	Establish baseline indicators for OVSJG sub-grantees that are consistent with the Justice Department's baseline indicators for Federal Formula grants.	OVSJG sub-grantees will be required to measure performance using a standard set of outputs and outcomes developed for each grant program based on the State Plan and/or proposals responses submitted to the Justice Department.	
Justice Grants Administration - 2 (2 Initiatives)			
2.1	Develop and align the strategic plans with grant recipients and the needs of the community.	OVSJG establishes and staffs advisory boards that are intended to provide guidance to community stakeholders on a variety of different subject matters. In addition, OVSJG is required to develop strategic plans, in accordance with the advisory boards. These strategic plans are developed through a city-wide inter/intra agency collaboration to address the needs of the local population. OVSJG will submit updates to the strategic plans and annual as required by federal funding sources with focus on improvements in victim services, juvenile delinquency and reentry efforts.	
2.2	Ensure 100% compliance of core requirements for Department of Justice (DOJ) grants. OVSGJ is tasked with ensuring compliance with enabling legislation for all DOJ funding sources.	Currently, the District is in full compliance with all core requirements of federal grants. OVSJG will continue to ensure that there is citywide compliance by engaging in site visits with stakeholders and sub-grantees.	

Initiative Number	Initiative Title	Initiative Description	
TOT			

Justice Grants Administration - 3 (1 Initiative)

| 3.1 | Provide leadership and financial support to all District agencies to improve the administration of justice within the District of Columbia. | OVSJG will to support and provide grant assistance to law enforcement and correctional agencies to coordinate supervision of offenders. The agency will use Byrne reallocation funds to prepare for major changes in program development initiated by the SORNA and PREA initiatives. | |

Justice Grants Administration - 4 (3 Initiatives)

4.2	Establish baseline truancy rates for selected schools using data collected from Local Education Agencies (LEA) and community-based organizations.	In order to assess the efficacy of the collaborations between schools and private, community-based organizations are effective, OVSJG will continue to monitor the truancy rate for each school measured.	
4.1	Establish collaborations among community-based organizations and targeted schools to implement JGA developed program strategies	OVSJG will develop program strategies and establish collaborations among community-based organizations and targeted elementary and middle schools to reducing truancy and increase attendance. OVSJG will continue to implement and expand Show Up, Stand Out (SUSO), a program that helps reduce truancy by working with families to provide resources to help kids attend school regularly.	
4.3	Provide outreach and engagement truancy reduction services to students who reach 5-9 unexcused in partnered LEAs	Through SUSO, OVSJG has implemented and executed truancy reduction services operated by qualified community-based organizations at numerous LEAs. OVSJG tracks the number of students that are reached by this program..	

Office of Victim Services - 1 (2 Initiatives)

| 1.1 | Build and sustain the continuum of medical forensic and crisis advocacy services for homicide and attempted homicide victims anchored at MedStar Washington Hospital Center. | OVSJG is responsible for building and sustaining direct core victim services in the District in the areas of sexual assault, domestic violence, child abuse, homicide human trafficking, and others. This is accomplished through a combination of special purpose revenue funds, local funds, federal formula funds and federal discretionary funds. OVSJG will expand the opportunities for crime victims in the District to receive on-call advocacy, crisis mental health, and medical forensic care immediately after a victimization through an on-site medical forensic and on-call advocacy program anchored at MedStar Washington Hospital Center. | |
| 1.2 | Coordinating and facilitating medical forensic and crisis advocacy care for domestic and sexual violence victims through MedStar Washington Hospital Center as the anchor site. | OVSJG will coordinate and expand programs to address the increase in sexual assault or intimate partner cases that require a medical forensic exam. All reporting and non-reporting victims who present for a medical forensic exam are entitled to paid, professional advocacy services, free prophylactic medication, and a free toxicology screen to determine the incapacitating substances, if any, that were present in the victim's blood or urine. OVSJG will expand the scope of the sexual assault and intimate partner violence continuum of services by investing in a review of the continuum of services for youth and adolescent victims of sexual violence, fund on-call advocacy services for victims of youth and adolescent victims of sexual violence, and increase access points for victims of intimate partner violence to access medical forensic care. | |

Office of Victim Services - 2 (3 Initiatives)

2.3	Coordinate the network of victim service providers in the District through development and coordination of the Victim Assistance Network.	Victims of violent crime in the District should have access to a network of exceptional services staffed by skilled service providers. Towards that goal, OVSJG facilitates the Victim Assistance Network, which is a network of all funded agencies and organizations, as well as allied organizations that are not funded. The Victim Assistance Network seeks to raise the standard of victim care and hold organizations accountable to that standard. OVSJG will assist the VAN in implementing its goals and objectives by providing staff resources and coordination efforts.	
2.1	Expand access to victim services for the campus populations by developing partnerships and providing technical assistance to the eight colleges and universities within the District.	It is essential that OVSJG adapt services and develop services that are easily accessed by college-aged victims. OVSJG will ensure that the eight campuses in DC and the campuses surrounding DC know of and are able to access District trauma services. OVSJG will develop toolkits to assist campuses in implementing new recommendations for victim services and will host a campus conference for all DC-based campuses.	
2.2	Expand access to victim services for victims of Limited English Proficiency by coordinating services and resources designed to assist LEP populations in accessing and receiving services.	It is essential to adequate service delivery that there is an established and functioning continuum of services that is culturally and linguistically competent. It is crucial that core services in the District have materials that have been translated into multiple languages. OVSJG will ensure that each community-based agency has a language access plan in place, has access to translated materials for each community-based agency, and will continue to expand access to the emergency and victim services interpreter bank.	

Office of Victim Services and Justice Grants FY2017

Agency Office of Victim Services and Justice Grants   **Agency Acronym** OVSJG

Fiscal Year 2017

▼ 2017 Strategic Objectives

Objective Number	Strategic Objective
1	Ensure that all victims of crime have access to coordinated, professional, trauma-informed, and victim-centered services.
2	Create opportunities and access for primary prevention and intervention programming towards the goal of reducing truancy, delinquency, and violence.
3	Create and sustain a coordinated community response that improves the administration of and access to justice and enhances outcomes for low-income citizens, returning citizens and members of marginalized communities within the District of Columbia.
4	Provide leadership in developing the capacity of and improving the performance of grantees.
5	Create and maintain a highly efficient, transparent and responsive District government.**

▼ 2017 Key Performance Indicators

Measure	FY 2017 Target		
1 – Ensure that all victims of crime have access to coordinated, professional, trauma-informed, and victim-centered services. (5 Measures)			
Percentage of victims who received information or support from DCVH call-takers to address caller needs and/or a referral by the DC crime victim services hotline.	95%		
Percentage of sexual assault victims who received on-call advocacy at police and/or hospital at the time of access.	99%		
Percentage of reported intimate partner violence (IPV) victims that received on-call advocacy services at the time of the exam	70%		
Percentage of victims of attempted homicide or homicide who received on-call advocacy at the time of the access to service	70%		
Percentage of victims who received language interpretation services of those that requested services.	80%		
2 – Create opportunities and access for primary prevention and intervention programming towards the goal of reducing truancy, delinquency, and violence. (3 Measures)			
Percentage of students in agency sponsored programs who reduce their truancy rate.	75%		
Percentage of schools participating in agency programs who reduce their chronic truancy rate.	65%		
Percentage of violence prevention program participants who demonstrate a change in knowledge, skills, or behaviors as a result of their participation.	87%		
3 - Create and sustain a coordinated community response that improves the administration of and access to justice and enhances outcomes for low-income citizens, returning citizens and members of marginalized communities within the District of Columbia. (3 Measures)			
Percentage of participants screened for eligibility for entry into the re-entry service programs	80%		
Percentage of new participants who	80%		

Measure	FY 2017 Target			
received re-entry services for the first time.				
Percentage of participants who successfully complete re-entry programs.	40%			

4 - Provide leadership in developing the capacity of and improving the performance of grantees. (5 Measures)

Measure	FY 2017 Target			
Percentage of budgeted federal grant funds lapsed at end of fiscal year.	5%			
Percentage of budgeted local grant funds lapsed at end of fiscal year.	5%			
Percentage of sub-grantees that are in full compliance of federal and local requirements.	100%			
Percentage of grantees submitting quarterly performance reports.	85%			
Percentage of participants in professional education programs who reported learning	80%			

5 - Create and maintain a highly efficient, transparent and responsive District government. (9 Measures)**

Measure	FY 2017 Target			
Contracts/Procurement- Expendable Budget spent on Certified Business Enterprises	Forthcoming October 2017			
Contracts/Procurement- Contracts lapsed into retroactive status	Forthcoming October 2017			
Budget- Local funds unspent	Forthcoming October 2017			
Budget- Federal Funds returned	Forthcoming October 2017			
Customer Service- Meeting Service Level Agreements	Forthcoming October 2017			
Human Resources- Vacancy Rate	Forthcoming October 2017			
Human Resources- Employee District residency	Forthcoming October 2017			
Human Resources- Employee Onboard Time	Forthcoming October 2017			
Performance Management- Employee Performance Plan Completion	Forthcoming October 2017			

▼ 2017 Operations

Operations Header	Operations Title	Operations Description	Type of Operations	# of Measures	# of Strategic Initiatives
1 - Ensure that all victims of crime have access to coordinated, professional, trauma-informed, and victim-centered services. (4 Activities)					
VICTIMS SERVICES GRANTS	Provide a comprehensive response to sexual assault victims in the District.	OVSJG continues to improve outcomes for victims of sexual assault by organizing and funding a continuum of care that increases the coordination and delivery of sexual assault services in the District.	Daily Service	0	2
VICTIMS SERVICES GRANTS	Provide a comprehensive response to intimate partner violence victims in the District.	OVSJG will improve outcomes for victims of intimate partner violence by organizing and funding a continuum of care that increases the coordination and delivery of intimate partner violence services in the District.	Daily Service	0	2
VICTIMS SERVICES GRANTS	Deliver a comprehensive response to underserved and marginalized victims in the District.	OVSJG provides funding for a variety of groups and programs that work with the immigrant community as well as the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and questioning (LGBTQ) population.	Daily Service	1	1
VICTIMS SERVICES GRANTS	Build a coordinated community response for all victims of crime that improves outcomes for survivors.	OVSJG is responsible for building and sustaining direct core victim services in the District that especially focus on victims of crime by funding a variety of community based providers.	Daily Service	6	3
TOT				7	8
2 - Create opportunities and access for primary prevention and intervention programming towards the goal of reducing truancy, delinquency, and violence. (3 Activities)					
				0	0

Operations Header	Operations Title	Operations Description	
INTERVENTION GRANT	Provide evidence-based violence prevention in-school programming throughout the District.	OVSJG funds programs that help prevent sexual and intimate partner violence through programs that provide participants a structured and supportive space to build individualized definitions of masculinity and healthy femininity.	
INTERVENTION GRANT	Reduce chronic truancy in the District	OVSJG will accomplish the goal of reducing truancy rates among young people throughout the District, by develop programs and collaborations among community-based organizations and schools that reduce truancy by working with families to provide resources to help students attend school regularly and improving the capacity of schools to address truancy.	
INTERVENTION GRANT	Develop and coordinate juvenile delinquency prevention programs in the District	OVSJG will work to reduce juvenile delinquency by funding programs and initiatives that create alternatives to incarceration, offer skills, and improve the quality of life for juveniles in the District.	
TOT			

3 - Create and sustain a coordinated community response that improves the administration of and access to justice and enhances outcomes for low-income citizens, returning citizens and members of marginalized communities within the District of Columbia. (3 Activities)

JUSTICE IMPROVEMENT GRANT	Build and expand the network of core service community-based providers that serve returning citizens.	OVSJG provides funding, technical support and resources for providers who work with returning citizens. OVSJG funded services include housing, job training and substance abuse and mental health services (co-occurring disorder) for returning citizens.	
JUSTICE IMPROVEMENT GRANT	Coordinate stakeholders in an effort to improve process with District's compliance of Sex Offender and Registration Notification Act (SORNA) and Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA)	OVSJG convenes quarterly meetings with stakeholders and provides leadership to ensure recommendations are adopted and implemented.	
JUSTICE IMPROVEMENT GRANT	Provide direct civil legal services to low-income and underserved District residents.	OVSJG provides funding to the Access to Justice Initiative which provides financial assistance to organizations and individuals who provide direct civil legal services to low-income and under-served District residents.	
TOT			

4 - Provide leadership in developing the capacity of and improving the performance of grantees. (6 Activities)

PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT	Enhance the capacity of grantees to collect, analyze and report performance data.	OVSJG works to improve the collection of performance data from its grantees that leads to the identification of efficiencies and improves outcomes. OVSJG will continue to evaluate and expand its grant performance management initiative.	
GRANT MANAGEMENT	Develop strategic plans as required by federal grant sources.	OVSJG develops strategic plans for the implementation of federal grants and works with sub-grantees to ensure their service delivery plans meet requirements.	
GRANT MANAGEMENT	Support advisory committees and task forces that provide recommendations on improving outcomes for residents.	OVSJG relies on feedback and recommendations from a variety of stakeholders including grantees, policy-makers, government officials, residents, and crime victims that improve the capacity of the agency to fulfill its mission. There are several task forces and committee's that inform the work of the agency and OVSJG supports these through technical assistance and regular staffing and participation in these meetings.	
PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT	Ensure compliance of core requirements for all federal grants.	As part of federal grant management, OVSJG is tasked with ensuring compliance with enabling legislation for federal funding sources.	
GRANT MANAGEMENT	Ensure federal and local grants funds are allocated and spent.	OVSJG is responsible for allocating and spending a variety of local and federal grants. To ensure success, it is important to monitor the financial performance of all grantees to ensure all resources are being efficiently and completely spent.	
PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT	Provide training and technical assistance opportunities to grantees to help enhance their capacity and improve outcomes.	OVSJG offers technical assistance and capacity building support for grantees. Additionally, the agency organizes workshops and conferences that include best-practice based continuing education for the professional development of grantees.	

▼ 2017 Workload Measures

All Workload Measures must be linked to a specific Operation. If Workload Measures are already in the system but not yet linked, email the Office of Performance Management with a spreadsheet that identifies to which Operation each Workload Measure belongs.

Workload Measures - Operations	Measure	Numerator Title	Units	
	1 - Build a coordinated community response for all victims of crime that improves outcomes for survivors. (6 Measures)			
	Number of victims receiving mental health services.	Number of victims receiving mental health services.	Victims	
	Number of victims receiving legal services through coordinated continuums.	Number of victims receiving legal services.	Victims	
	Number of victims served by the DC crime victim services hotline.	Number of victims served by the DC crime victim services hotline.	Victims	
	Number of victims provided housing services.	Number of victims provided housing services.	Victims	

Measure	Numerator Title	Units
Number of victims receiving medical forensic care.	Number of victims receiving medical forensic care.	Victims
Number of secondary victims of homicide served through crisis intervention at the point of decedent identification.	Number of secondary victims of homicide served through crisis intervention at the point of decedent identification.	Secondary Victims

1 – Deliver a comprehensive response to underserved and marginalized victims in the District.

Number of victims who received interpretation services.	Number of victims who received interpretation services.	Victims

2 – Reduce chronic truancy in the District (2 Measures)

Number of schools participating in truancy reduction programs	Number of schools participating in truancy reduction programs	Schools
Number of community-based providers that work with schools to reduce truancy.	Number of community-based providers	Community-based providers

3 – Build and expand the network of core service community-based providers that serve returning citizens.   (2 Measures)

Number of providers offering funded mental health and substance abuse programs for returning citizens.	Number of providers offering funded mental health and substance abuse programs for returning citizens.	Providers
Total number of participants in funded re-entry programs	Total number of participants in funded re-entry programs	Participants

3 – Coordinate stakeholders in an effort to improve process with District's compliance of Sex Offender and Registration Notification Act (SORNA) and Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) (1 Measure)

Number of meetings held with stakeholders to improve SORNA and PREA initiatives.	Number of meetings held with stakeholders to improve SORNA and PREA initiatives.	Meetings

4 – Develop strategic plans as required by federal grant sources.   (1 Measure)

Number of strategic plans completed and approved by federal funders.	Number of strategic plans completed and approved by federal funders.	Strategic Plans

4 – Provide training and technical assistance opportunities to grantees to help enhance their capacity and improve outcomes.   (2 Measures)

Number of participants in training programs	Number of participants in training programs	Participants
Number of technical assistance sessions provided	Number of technical assistance sessions provided.	Technical Assistance Sessions

▼ 2017 Strategic Initiatives

Strategic Initiative Title	Strategic Initiative Description
GRANT MANAGEMENT (1 Strategic Initiative-Operation Link)	
Collection and reporting of service outcome measures	Reentry service providers will begin collecting and reporting service outcome data in order to determine efficacy of service delivery and identify opportunities for enhancement and additional technical assistance needed.
Decrease truancy and tardiness via use of attendance based app	Beginning in School Year 16-17, students engaged in the Show Up Stand Out (SUSO) Program will have access to a cellphone app that will reward points to teams based upon check-ins at school in the morning. Points will be accrued to earn prizes for the winning teams.
JUSTICE IMPROVEMENT GRANT (1 Strategic Initiative-Operation Link)	
Establish a community-based reentry service provider network	OVSJG, in partnership with MORCA, will provide administrative support for the establishment of a community based reentry service provider network. The network, operating similarly to the establish Victim Assistance Network (VAN) will bring together reentry service providers with the goals of coordinating service delivery, identifying gaps in services and emerging needs, and enhancing outcomes for returning citizens.

Strategic Initiative Title	Strategic Initiative Description

VICTIMS SERVICES GRANTS (8 Strategic initiative-operation links)

Expand Sexual Assault Victim Advocacy Services	Expand sexual assault victim advocacy services to ensure that all victims of sexual assault have access to oncall advocacy, including those victims who report outside of the DC SANE process
Establish credentialing system for advocates serving sexual assault victims.	Establish a system of credentialing for advocates serving sexual assault victims so that all advocates responding to sexual assault victims have confidential communication privileges and a standardized level of knowledge.
Establish, staff, and coordinate the District's High Risk Domestic Violence Review Team	Establish, staff, and coordinate the District's High Risk Domestic Violence Review Team to ensure law enforcement and social services systems visibility, and coordination of services to victims, on the domestic violence cases with highest risk of lethality. The High Risk Domestic Violence Review Team will begin meeting on a monthly basis no later than January 1, 2017.
Expand on-call medical forensic services for victims of intimate partner violence	Expand on-call medical forensic services for victims of intimate partner violence to one to three additional sites ensuring that victims of intimate partner violence will have access to medical forensic services at any time of the day at multiple sites.
Expand access to the Emergency and Victim Services Interpreter Bank	Expand access to trauma-informed language interpreters and translations through the Emergency and Victim Services Interpreter Bank by adding additional interpreters.
Expand access to the Victim Legal Network of DC	Expand access to the Victim Legal Network of DC by adding a client navigator that ensures a centralized point of intake for victims who are seeking legal services
Expand the all victim services hotline.	Expand the all victim services hotline to include 24/7/365 access to text and chat functions.
Organize domestic violence specific housing providers into a continuum of services.	Organize the domestic violence specific emergency and transitional housing providers into a continuum of services through an agreed upon Memorandum of Understanding to enable continuous services to families facing homelessness and domestic violence.

Choice Research Associates
What gets measured gets done.

Deliberative To

District of Columbia

Office of Victim Services and Justice Grants

Show Up, Stand Out (SUSO)

Year 2 2013-2014 Final Report
Stand Out (SUSO) Truancy Prevention
Family Engagement and Youth Participation Programs

REDACTED

Zachary R. Rowan
Shawn M. Flower

January 2017

Table of Contents

Table of Tables

Executive Summary

Choice Research Associates (CRA) was awarded a grant from the District of Columbia Office of Victim Services Justice (OVSJG) to evaluate the Show Up, Stand Out (SUSO) truancy intervention program. This project involves conducting a comprehensive evaluation of the SUSO grant initiative designed to reduce truancy for DCPS elementary and middle school youth. This project is a joint effort with partners including OVSJG, District of Columbia's Public School, selected schools in Wards 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 and 7 Youth Service Providers, and the OVSJG funded Community Based Organizations (CBOs).

SUSO is comprised of two components tailored for either elementary or middle school youth. The Family Engagement program assists elementary school youth with 5 to 9 unexcused absences and their families are provided wraparound services and truancy prevention efforts by the CBOs. The Youth Participation program assist middle school youth with at least 5 unexcused absences who are engaged by the Youth Service Providers (YSP) in a variety of activity clubs that seek to promote school engagement and address absenteeism.

This evaluation is based on the evaluation plan established with the CBOs and OVSJG in December 2012, and subsequently modified over the course of the program development. Unfortunately, one of the key challenges of this project was the quality and quantity of the data submitted for analysis. Starting in Year 2 (2013-2014) of the project, OVSJG commissioned an Efforts to Outcomes (ETO) enterprise system intended to ensure that all CBOs participating in this project provide the data necessary to assess their compliance with program milestones. CBOs participated in extensive training to learn how to implement ETO and manage data collection efforts.

This report focuses on the second year of program activity – from August 2013 when the first referrals were recorded, through the end of the school year in June 2014. For the analyses presented in this report, there were 2,430 eligible referrals for SUSO family engagement services and 757 eligible referrals for SUSO youth participation program. This report includes descriptive information about the referrals to both programs for each CBO, and an examination of compliance with program implementation standards for the Family Engagement program.

This report also provides several sets of outcome results comparing those referred to the SUSO program (treatment group) to a comparison group youth selected by DC Public Schools (DCPS) for both the family engagement and youth participation programs. Key findings of the evaluation include:

Family Engagement Program Outcomes

- For the 2013-2014 school year, the SUSO family engagement treatment group had significantly fewer total unexcused absences and higher in-seat attendance at year-end then a group of comparison youth.
- Propensity score analyses for the family engagement treatment youth that accounted for the timing of referral to SUSO indicated that treatment youth experienced worse or statistically indifferent attendance outcomes on a quarterly basis when compared to a control group.
- Compared to the 2012-2012 school year, family engagement treatment youth generally reported significantly fewer unexcused absences on a quarterly basis.

Youth Participation Program Outcomes

- For the 2013-2014 school year, the SUSO youth participation treatment group had significantly more total unexcused absences and significantly more excused absences at year-end then a group of comparison group.
- Propensity score analyses for the youth participation treatment youth that accounted for the timing of referral to SUSO indicated that treatment youth experienced worse or statistically indifferent attendance outcomes on a quarterly basis when compared to a control group.
- Compared to the 2012-2013 school year, youth participation treatment youth generally reported significantly fewer or a statistically indifferent number of unexcused absences on a quarterly basis.

The results of the second year of SUSO demonstrate some promising results. However, there are a number of important limitations that should be considered before making firm conclusions about the effectiveness of the SUSO program. We conclude this report by discussing these limitations and offer substantive recommendations for improving the quality and rigor of the SUSO program.

Overview

This final report is intended to provide status information and changes in attendance for youth referred to the Family Engagement (FE) and Youth Participation (YP) programs of SUSO during the second year of program activity – from August 2013 through the end of the school year in June 2014.   Youth were included in this analysis only if they were eligible to participate in SUSO (had between 5 and 9 absences at the time of referral and/or had at least 3 absences but were identified as high risk) and were in elementary school (K-5th grade) in the FE program or had 5 or more absences in middle school (6th to 8th grade) and were referred to the YP program. There were 2,430 eligible referrals for SUSO family engagement services and 757 eligible referrals for SUSO youth participation program.

This report includes descriptive information about the referrals to both programs for each CBO, and an examination of compliance with program implementation standards for the Family Engagement program.[1] This report also contains a comprehensive set of evaluations of the impact that the SUSO intervention had on eligible youth referred to the program during the 2013-2014 school year. In total, the analyses seek to identify whether the intervention reduced the number of unexcused absences. The report presents a series of analyses that increase in methodological rigor in order to account for some of the features of the program and to develop a quasi-experimental estimate of the treatment effect. The report will discuss the family engagement and youth participation programs separately.

Family Engagement Referrals

Table 1 provides referrals for family engagement overall and by CBO for elementary age youth. There were 2,785 referrals to the 7 CBOs since the beginning of the school year. However, of those 2,785, the CBOs received 486 referrals for youth with fewer than 5 absences, and these cases are classified as "Tracking Only" in the contact log until they reach the threshold of 5 absences (where they become active cases). Of the 486 initial "Tracking only" referrals, 199 eventually became active referrals, leaving 287 "Tracking only" cases; for a total of 2,498 referrals, of which 2,430 (or 97%) were eligible to participate in the program. Eligibility was based on the CBO's assessment of whether the youth referred had between 5 and 9 absences and were in kindergarten through 8th grade or had fewer than 5 absences but were identified by the school as high risk. Among the CBOs, a total of 68 referrals were ineligible. Note that Table 1 also provides the number of referrals by unique youth and by unique family[2].

---

[1] Due to the lack of data, we were unable to conduct a process evaluation for the YP program.
[2] There were 13 referrals where no family information was provided. As we are unable to determine if these are unique families, these 13 referrals are excluded from all unique family analysis in this report.

Table 1: Elementary School Referrals Overall and by CBO

CBO	Total Referrals	Percent of All Referrals	Referrals Excluding Tracking Only Referrals	Ineligible Referrals	Eligible Referrals By Unique Youth	Eligible Referrals By Unique Family
CBO A	162	6%	161	4	145	134
CBO B	938	34%	938	18	796	690
CBO C	462	17%	458	19	375	374
CBO D	285	10%	285	4	272	245
CBO E	187	7%	187	0	185	162
CBO F	503	18%	221	8	204	185
CBO G	248	9%	248	15	229	209
Total	**2,785**		**2,498**	**68**	**2,206**	**1,999**

Status of Referrals

As indicated in Table 2, of the 2,430 referrals that were eligible (2,498 referrals excluding all "Tracking only" cases and less 68 ineligible case) 3% are referrals that the CBO indicated they were still attempting to engage the family into the program, 3% were currently engaged, 1% had not responded to attempts to contact the family and were pending closure, and the remaining 93% of referrals are closed. Note the remaining 3 referrals (less than 1%) were missing the status information and could not be included in this table.

Table 2: Referral Status N=2,430

Status	Frequency	Percent
Active Referral -- CBO Is Attempting to Engage	71	3%
Engaged in the Program	62	3%
No Response, Pending Closure	32	1%
Referral Closed	2,262	93%
Missing Data – Unable to Assess	3	<1%
Total	**2,430**	**100%**

Reasons for Refusal of Services

Among the 2,262 cases that were closed, 844 were closed because the families refused to participate. Table 3 provides the breakdown of reasons for their refusal, and the top four reasons were the parent or child is too busy or not interested (353 of 844 referrals or 42%); the parent stated that notes had been sent to the school and were not recorded, and/or issues with the school (271 or 32%); the child is not truant (53 or 6%); and the parent does not want agency involvement (39 or 5%).

Table 3: Of Closed Referrals, Reasons Refused to Participate, N=844

Stated Reason for Refusal to Participate	Frequency	Percent
Parent stated sent notes to school, were not recorded properly; issues with school	271	32%
Parent or child is too busy or not interested	353	42%
Parent does not want any agency involvement	39	5%
The program is too long and too intrusive.	18	2%
The child is not truant	53	6%
Youth will transfer/has transferred to different school	35	4%
Parent promises won't miss any more days	2	<1%
Child illness is the cause of the absences	22	3%
Current case with CFSA	7	1%
Other	44	5%
Total	**844**	**100%**

Reasons Why Referrals Are Closed

Table 4 looks at the reasons the referral was closed, **other** than refusal to participate. Other than the 844 cases where the family refused to participate, 1,421 referrals were closed for a variety of other reasons. Among these closed cases, 59 referrals (4%) were closed because of a lack of contact information or the CBO case worker was unable to locate the family; 344 referrals (24%) never responded to the CBOs engagement efforts; for 58 referrals (4%), the CBO failed to follow-up on the referral within the stated 14-day time frame and closed these cases; and missing data for 220 referrals (15%) rendered the reason the case was closed unclear. However, for 533 (38%) referrals, case notes indicated that the school withdrew the referral because the family

provided documentation of absences as excused, and/or that notes were derived as a result of the intervention of the CBO.

Table 4: Of Closed Referrals, Reasons Referral Closed, N=1,421

Reason for Case Closure	Frequency	Percent
No Contact Information/Unable to Locate Family	59	4%
No Response	344	24%
Referral withdrawn from School	12	1%
Referred to CFSA	26	2%
Completed Program	55	4%
Stopped Participating in CBO Program before Completion	25	2%
Other Reasons	89	6%
School withdrew referral because family provided documentation and/or provided notes to school with CBO assistance	533	38%
CBO Failed to Follow-up On Referral Within Time Frame	58	4%
Unable to Assess Given Missing Data	220	15%
Total	**1,421**	**100%**

Year 2 Referrals to Services & Efforts

This section of the report provides an overall assessment of the number of contacts made, type of contact, and any referrals to services made by the CBOs on behalf of the families that were referred to SUSO. Since the Efforts-to-Outcome system was not live during Year 2 of SUSO, CBOs were responsible for tracking contacts and case notes through their own data management systems. Each CBO submitted to Choice Research Associates (CRA) case notes on youth who were engaged into the SUSO Program.

Methodology & Limitations

CRA reviewed the case notes to discern whether contacts with families were successful or unsuccessful and whether CBOs initiated referrals to service for the family. To facilitate this process, case notes were entered into QSR NVivo qualitative software that enables users to search and code for themes, key terms, and relationships within data such as case notes. CRA completed a review of each engaged youth's case notes with NVivo to identify references

to successful/unsuccessful contacts and case managers providing referrals to services (e.g., food banks, employment opportunities). CRA specifically reviewed the case notes for key words that reflected the overall mission of the SUSO program. If a key search term was identified, that text would be selected and coded accordingly. The following is an example of a case note that demonstrates how this type of data were coded:

"CM gave Client more information **on food bank in her area and gave the client referrals**."

This case note would be coded as both being a successful contact and as providing the family with Food Assistance. CRA adopted a descriptive coding strategy that sought to identify any example of case managers providing referrals or engaging in efforts with the families as part of their case management strategy. It is important to note that the following results are contingent upon the quality and detail of the case notes data provided to CRA, as well as the consistency of coding across the case notes by CRA. Several additional caveats are worth mentioning. First, due to the difficulty in isolating *unique* instances of referrals to the same type of service (i.e., two different instances of families being referred to job opportunities), cases were coded as either receiving a type of referral for service or not during the entirety of family involvement with SUSO. Additionally, comparisons across CBOs should be viewed with some caution as there was substantial variation in the manner case notes were recorded (e.g., level of detail about contacts) by different CBOs and also by case managers within CBOs.

In addition, the submission of case notes to CRA included case notes that occurred either prior to the beginning of the school year, or after the school year. This is problematic for the purposes of identifying the impact of the SUSO treatment on the designated outcome of the program – the number of unexcused absences. Including these contacts that are beyond the period of the school year would erroneously associate the dosage of the treatment of the program. In order to address this issue, we chose to remove youth who had at least 25% of their contacts in the case notes occur outside of the terms of 2013-2014 school year. This threshold was selected in part because there were instances where case managers documented efforts or referrals to services for families in case notes subsequent to the actual contact where such efforts were made. We wanted to address this issue by allowing some youth who only had a relatively small portion of contacts beyond the school year to remain in the sample and capture the overall efforts. This is clearly a limitation of the existing analysis and future qualitative assessment of the dosage effects of SUSO should ensure that efforts in the treatment are restricted to the school year time frame.

Outcome of Case Notes

The first step in the analysis was to categorize each case note into either a successful or unsuccessful contact. Consistent with SUSO contact categorizations, successful contacts included those where the case manager made completed contact with the youth,

guardian/parent/adult, or school staff member that was the intended target of the contact. Unsuccessful contacts included those where the case manager did not make contact with any of these individuals and had to leave a voicemail, the family did not show up for meetings, and/or could not gain entry to the family's house.

The findings highlighted in Table 5 below indicate that among all CBOs, there were 370 youth included in the contact notes that received a total of 5,523 contacts. Approximately 77% of all CBO contacts were deemed to be successful, whereas 23% of all CBO contacts were considered unsuccessful. Additionally, the average number of contacts per youth was 22.0. There are large differences in the number of contacts that each CBO reported, with CBO G reporting 56 total contacts and CBO E reporting 1,398 contacts. Interestingly, although CBO A had a small number of youth included in their case notes, they engaged in a relatively large number of contacts and averaged the highest number of contacts per youth (30.7). CBO G had the highest percentage of successful contacts (93%) and CBO B had the lowest percentage of successful contacts (72%).

Table 5: Total Number of Contacts by CBO and Average by Person

CBO	Total Number of Youth	Total Number of Contacts	Proportion of Successful Contacts	Proportion of Unsuccessful Contacts	Average Number of Contacts Per Youth
CBO A	10	307	241 of 307 = 79%	66 of 307 = 21%	30.7
CBO G	15	56	52 of 56 = 93%	4 of 56 = 7%	3.7
CBO C	44	1342	1040 of 1342 = 77%	302 of 1342 = 23%	30.5
CBO D	12	340	231 of 340 = 68%	109 of 340 = 32%	28.3
CBO B	148	745	535 of 745 = 72%	210 of 745 = 28%	5.0
CBO E	32	1398	1064 of 1398 = 80%	334 of 1398 = 20%	43.7
CBO F	109	1335	1089 of 1335 = 82%	246 of 1335 = 18%	12.2
Total	**370**	**5523**	**4252 of 5523 = 77%**	**1271 of 5523 = 23%**	**22.0**