

**Act 185 Grant Proposal
 Benchmarks for Evaluation Committee
 DRAFT July 2, 2019**

Section 1.1 Main Summary	Rating Scale	Possible Points
A. Provide information about the agency and the individuals responsible for the application and grant award. B. Provide a brief description of the program. C. Describe in plain language the intent of the project.	N/A-see below	N/A

Benchmarks
 Information provided in the main summary section should be rated with Section 1.5 Project Narrative and Summary

Section 1.2 Budget Detail and Narrative	Rating Scale	Possible Points
A. Provide a detailed budget for this project. For each budget item or category, enter a justification that describes how the item will be used during the grant period. B. If land was acquired, explain why land owned by the jurisdiction was not chosen. C. Include and describe the source of the required 5% cash match calculation. D. Describe in detail how the budget relates to the overall project implementation plan, including any proposed activities and the budget for the project. E. Include the proposed fee for service (Average Daily Rate) from counties or tribes as well as the minimum funding you need from the state to pursue your construction project.	Excellent: 45-60 Very Good: 31-44 Good/Fair: 21-30 Poor: 20 or below	60

Benchmarks			
<p>Excellent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All information requested is clearly provided. The agency's budget is detailed and includes a justification that describes how each item will be used during the grant period. If land was acquired, the agency provides adequate justification for not choosing land owned by jurisdiction. The agency calculated and included its required match amount in its budget narrative. The agency clearly describes the source of its required 5% Cash Match. The agency provides a detailed narrative that describes the agency's proposed activities and the budget for its project. The agency attached any existing vendor quotes associated with its requested budget or explained that it did not have any existing vendor quotes. 	<p>Very Good</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All information requested is provided. The agency's budget is detailed and includes a justification that describes how each item will be used during the grant period. If land was acquired, the agency provides justification for not choosing land owned by jurisdiction. The agency calculated and included its required match amount in its budget narrative. The agency describes the source of its required 5% Cash Match. The agency provides a narrative that describes the agency's proposed activities and the budget for its project. The agency may not have attached any existing vendor quotes or explain whether it has any existing vendor quotes. The agency may not have included its proposed fee for service (Average Daily 	<p>Good/Fair</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most information requested is provided. Portions of the response are unclear or lack detail. The agency's budget could be more detailed and does not include a justification that adequately describes how each item will be used during the grant period. The agency describes how its budget relates to the overall project implementation plan, but the relationship is unclear. The agency provides a narrative that describes the agency's proposed activities and the budget for its project, but the narrative does not clearly describe the agency's proposed activities or budget. The agency did not attach any existing vendor quotes or explain whether it has any existing vendor quotes. 	<p>Poor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The agency failed to respond to all the questions, or its responses are unclear and lack depth. The agency did not describe how its budget relates to the overall project implementation plan, or it did and the relationship is unclear. The agency's narrative is unclear and lacks detail. The agency included ineligible expenses. The agency did not describe the source of its required 5% Cash Match. The agency did not include its proposed fee for service (Average Daily Rate) from counties or tribes or the minimum funding it needs from the state to pursue its construction project. In general, the reasonableness of the budget calculations is questionable.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The agency included its proposed fee for service (Average Daily Rate) from counties or tribes as well as the minimum funding it needs from the state to pursue its construction project. In general, all budget calculations appear to be reasonable and well-supported by available information. 	<p>Rate) from counties or tribes or the minimum funding it needs from the state to pursue its construction project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In general, budget calculations appear to be reasonable, although support may be more limited. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The agency did not clearly describe the source of its required 5% Cash Match. The agency included its proposed fee for service (Average Daily Rate) from counties or tribes or the minimum funding it needs from the state to pursue its construction project, but one or both of the numbers is unclear or unjustified. In general, it is difficult to assess the reasonableness of budget calculations due to lack of support. 	
--	--	--	--

Section 1.3 Geographical/Facility Information	Rating Scale	Possible Points
<p>A. Describe the viability of a SRCCCY in your jurisdiction, including specific location details.</p> <p>B. Detail the anticipated population your facility is expected to serve and explain the analysis that was completed to determine the proposed capacity.</p> <p>C. Note the minimum and maximum number of youths the agency is planning to serve.</p> <p>D. Note how many females are expected to be served by the facility.</p> <p>E. If you are proposing to co-locate the proposed SRCCCY with a county secure detention facility, provide a detailed description of the current facility including existing capacity and programming.</p>	<p>Excellent: 71-90 Very Good: 51-70 Good/Fair: 31-50 Poor: 30 or below</p>	<p>90</p>

Benchmarks			
<p>Excellent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All information requested is clearly provided. The agency provides clear evidence that a SRCCCY would be viable in its jurisdiction. The location identified by the agency appears viable. The agency has engaged the community at large and other stakeholders on the location chosen for the SRCCCY. The agency provides detailed information about the anticipated population the facility is expected to serve and clearly describes the analysis that was completed to determine the proposed capacity; the calculation appears accurate. The agency demonstrates that it has the capacity to serve the number of youths it is planning to serve. If the agency is proposing a portion of the facility be used to serve females, it describes the anticipated source/drivers of the population, including how many females the jurisdiction is currently 	<p>Very Good</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All information requested is provided. The agency provides clear evidence that a SRCCCY would be viable in its jurisdiction. The location identified by the agency appears viable. The agency provides information about the anticipated population the facility is expected to serve and adequately describes the analysis that was completed to determine the proposed capacity; the calculation appears accurate. The agency demonstrates that it has the capacity to serve the number of youths it is planning to serve. If the agency is proposing a portion of the facility be used to serve females, it describes the anticipated source/drivers of the population, including how many females the jurisdiction is currently serving, are detained out of state, or are currently at Copper Lake School. 	<p>Good/Fair</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most information requested is provided. Portions of the response are unclear or lack detail. The agency provides adequate evidence that a SRCCCY would be viable in its jurisdiction. There is some question whether the location identified by the agency would be viable. The agency provided a narrative regarding the viability of a SRCCCY in the jurisdiction but does not include specific location details. The agency provides information about the anticipated population the facility is expected to serve, but the analysis that it completed to determine the proposed capacity is unclear; there is some question whether the calculation is accurate. The agency noted the minimum and maximum number of youths it is planning to serve but it is unclear whether the 	<p>Poor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The agency failed to respond to all the questions, responses are unclear and lack depth. The agency's narrative does not adequately address the viability of a SRCCCY in the jurisdiction. The agency does not provide adequate information about the anticipated population the facility is expected to serve. The agency does not note the minimum and maximum youth it is planning to serve. The agency does not specify whether it is proposing a portion of the facility be used to serve females or does not describe how many females the jurisdiction is currently serving, are detained out of state, or are currently at Copper Lake School.

<p>serving, are detained out of state, or are currently at Copper Lake School.</p>		<p>agency has the capacity to serve the anticipated population.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the agency is proposing a portion of the facility be used to serve females, it describes the anticipated source/drivers of the population, including how many females the jurisdiction is currently serving, are detained out of state, or are currently at Copper Lake School. 	
--	--	--	--

Section 1.4a Assessment of Resources/Programming: Programming	Rating Scale	Possible Points
<p>A. Provide a description of how evidence-based programs and services will function in the proposed SRCCCY, and current programming within your jurisdiction for youth in the justice system.</p> <p>B. Provide details regarding the programs outlined in ER DOC 347, Subchapter VIII, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> programming that consists of structured treatment, leisure, recreational, exercise, and educational activities and incorporates evidence-based practices and trauma-informed principles programs and services that are responsive to the genders, sexual orientations, disabilities, socio-economic status, cultural, racial, and ethnic backgrounds, experiences, interests, and primary languages of youth proposed community partnerships for programming partnership with the school district on provision of education vocational opportunities independent living and life skills programming leisure activities, recreation, and exercise youth, family, and social supporter engagement case plan and treatment sex offender treatment specialized mental health services services for female offenders PREA compliance medical care services for trafficked youth transitional services to prevent recidivism <p>C. Provide information on how the programming outlined above will serve the county's/tribe's unique population.</p>	<p>Excellent: 60-75 Very Good: 45-59 Good/Fair: 26-44 Poor: 25 or below</p>	<p>75</p>

Benchmarks			
<p>Excellent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All information requested is clearly provided. The agency provides a detailed description of how evidence-based programs and services will function in the proposed SRCCCY; much of the agency's current programming for youth in the justice system will be appropriate for youth in the proposed SRCCCY. 	<p>Very Good</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All information requested is provided. The agency provides a description of how evidence-based programs and services will function in the proposed SRCCCY; some of the agency's current programming for youth in the justice system will be appropriate for youth in the proposed SRCCCY. 	<p>Good/Fair</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most information requested is provided. Portions of the response are unclear or lack detail. The agency provides some description of how evidence-based programs and services will function in the proposed SRCCCY; the agency also provides some description of its current programming for youth in the justice system. 	<p>Poor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The agency failed to respond to all the questions, responses are unclear and lack depth. The agency fails to provide a clear description of how evidence-based programs and services will function in the proposed SRCCCY; and/or the agency provides an unclear description of its

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The agency provides details regarding the programs and service outlined in ER DOC 347, Subchapter VIII; the programs and services incorporate evidence-based practices and trauma-informed principles. The agency provides details about how the programming it outlines addresses its region's unique population needs. The agency provides details regarding how their services are improved under this model compared to their current facility and long-term program (if applicable). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The agency provides a plan regarding the programs and services outlined in ER DOC 347, Subchapter VIII; most of the programs and services incorporate evidence-based practices and trauma-informed principles. The agency provides information about how the programming it outlines addresses its region's unique population needs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The agency provides an incomplete or somewhat unclear plan regarding the programs and services outlined in ER DOC 347, Subchapter VIII; some of the programs and services incorporate evidence-based practices and trauma-informed principles. The agency provides information about how the programming it outlines addresses its region's unique population needs, but the information is somewhat unclear. 	<p>current programming for youth in the justice system.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The agency provides an incomplete or unclear plan regarding the programs and services outlined in ER DOC 347, Subchapter VIII; it is unclear whether the programs and services incorporate evidence-based practices and trauma-informed principles. The agency provides incomplete information about how the programming it outlines addresses its region's unique population needs, and/or the information is unclear.
---	---	--	--

Section 1.4b Assessment of Resources/Programming: Space and Resources	Rating Scale	Possible Points
<p>A. Discuss proposed safety and security practices as outlined in ER DOC 347, Subchapter IX.</p> <p>B. Discuss approach to confinement, use of force, and use of restraints</p> <p>C. Discuss the space/resources being proposed, including square footage and projected floor plan regarding ER DOC 347.10, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> youth housing, including sleeping space, dayrooms, and toilets receiving room holding rooms multipurpose rooms classrooms quiet space indoor recreation space outdoor space healthcare space (medical, mental health, dental) food service space receiving space visitation space specific considerations for collocated facilities (ER DOC 347, Subchapter XII) housing 	<p>Excellent: 60-75 Very Good: 45-59 Good/Fair: 26-44 Poor: 25 or below</p>	<p>75</p>
Benchmarks		

<p>Excellent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All information requested is clearly provided. The agency provides detailed information about its safety and security practices pursuant to ER DOC 347, Subchapter IX, and practices meet the requirements under that subchapter. The agency provides detailed information about its approach to confinement and agency's approach meets the requirements under ER DOC 347, including alternatives to confinement. The agency provides detailed information about its use of force and agency's approach meets the requirements under ER DOC 347, including alternatives to use of force. The agency provides detailed information about its use of restraints and agency's approach meets the requirements under ER DOC 347, including alternatives to restraints. The agency provides detailed information about proposed use of space and resources under ER DOC 347.10. If the agency proposes a collocated facility, the specific considerations outlined in ER DOC 347, Subchapter XII, including staffing and physical space, are addressed in detail. 	<p>Very Good</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All information requested is provided. The agency provides adequate information about proposed safety and security practices pursuant to ER DOC 347, Subchapter IX, and practices meet the requirements under that subchapter. The agency provides information about its approach to confinement and the agency's approach meets the requirements under ER DOC 347. The agency provides information about its approach to its use of force and agency's approach meets the requirements under ER DOC 347. The agency provides information about its use of restraint and agency's approach meet the requirements under ER DOC 347. The agency provides some information about proposed use of space and resources under ER DOC 347.10. 	<p>Good/Fair</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most information requested is provided. Portions of the response are unclear or lack detail. The agency provides information about its proposed safety and security practices pursuant to ER DOC 347, Subchapter IX, but the information lacks detail. The agency provides information about its approach to confinement, use of force, and use of restraint, but the policies are not detailed. Approaches appear to meet the requirements under ER DOC 347. The agency provides some information about its proposed use of space and resources under ER DOC 347.10. 	<p>Poor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The agency failed to respond to all the questions, responses are unclear and lack depth The agency provides inadequate information about its proposed safety and security practices pursuant to ER DOC 347, Subchapter IX The agency provides inadequate information about its approach to confinement, use of force, and use of restraint or approaches do not meet the requirements under ER DOC 347. The agency provides inadequate information about its proposed use of space and resources under ER DOC 347.10.
---	---	---	---

Section 1.5 Project Narrative and Summary	Rating Scale	Possible Points
<p>A. Describe the project being proposed to address the requirements of this solicitation.</p> <p>B. Describe how the proposed project fits with the existing status of the juvenile facility within the county's or tribe's jurisdiction and how the proposed project fits within the county's/ tribe's overall continuum of care and theory of change for youth in the justice system.</p> <p>C. Detail whether this project will include new construction, or funding to renovate an existing facility. If the project proposes a new facility, certify that renovation of existing facilities was considered prior to making this decision.</p> <p>D. Discuss how local stakeholder input and support for the project was gathered, including from relevant stakeholders.</p> <p>E. Identify the capabilities and competencies of the applying county/tribe that would point toward success of the proposed project, including evidence of local/state collaborations, and a demonstration of the commitment of local partners. Include experience related to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> working with adolescents operating a program of similar size/scope 	<p>Excellent: 101-150 Very Good: 76-100 Good/Fair: 51-75 Poor: 50 or below</p>	<p>150</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supervising and serving youth in a similar setting or manner, including conducting assessments, case planning, and aftercare planning • de-escalation and the use of physical and mechanical restraints • utilizing trauma-informed care principles in daily care and program operations, with both youth and staff • maintaining records and reporting data • and implementation plan <p>F. Provide detailed information regarding how the project will be implemented, including proposed timeline ranges. Include a work plan and a timeline to depict the time, individuals and/or agencies associated with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • building or remodeling an existing facility (if the building has not yet been secured, the time associated with the plan for securing it) • hiring and training of staff through the first year of operations • developing the written operational plan, including all the required policies and procedure • establishing contracts, MOUs, or other agreements, where needed <p>G. Provide a staffing plan that identifies and provides for enough staff to provide adequate and continuous supervision of youth under ER DOC 347.17. The staffing plan should include back-up plans for staff shortages and ramp-up plans for emergency response and a proposed training plan, as available, including any training required to serve the target population.</p>		
---	--	--

Benchmarks			
<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Very Good</u>	<u>Good/Fair</u>	<u>Poor</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All information requested is clearly provided. • The agency provides detailed information about the project, including the individuals responsible for the application and grant award. • The agency describes how the proposed project fits with the existing status of the juvenile facility within the county's or tribe's jurisdiction and how the proposed project fits within the county's/ tribe's overall continuum of care and theory of change for youth in the justice system. • The agency engaged in a robust local stakeholder input process and the agency incorporated input from youth and families, community stakeholders, health practitioners, experts in juvenile justice and trauma-informed care, and other relevant stakeholders. • The agency demonstrates capabilities and competencies that point toward success. • The agency provides strong evidence of having the program experience necessary to run a successful SRCCCY, including working with adolescents, operating a program of similar size/scope, supervising youth in a similar setting, conducting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All information requested is provided. • The agency provides detailed information about the project, including the individuals responsible for the application and grant award. • The agency describes how the project fits with the existing status of the juvenile facility within the jurisdiction or how the project fits within the overall continuum of care. • The agency engaged in the local stakeholder input process and the agency incorporated input from youth and families, community stakeholders, health practitioners, experts in juvenile justice and trauma-informed care, and other relevant stakeholders. • The agency describes capabilities and competencies that appear to point toward success • The agency provides evidence of having the program experience necessary to run a successful SRCCCY, including working with adolescents, operating a program of similar size/scope, supervising youth in a similar setting, conducting youth assessments, case planning, de-escalation • The agency includes a work plan and timeline that lacks some detail. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most information requested is provided. • The agency provides information about the project that lacks some details requested or some of its explanations are unclear. • The agency provides detailed information about the project but there may be some question about how the proposed project fits with the existing status of the juvenile facility within the jurisdiction or how the project fits within the overall continuum of care. • The agency describes the extent of the local stakeholder input process the agency considered input from youth and families, community stakeholders, health practitioners, experts in juvenile justice and trauma-informed care, and other relevant stakeholders. • The agency describes capabilities and competencies that appear to point toward success • The agency provides evidence of having the program experience necessary to run a successful SRCCCY, including working with adolescents, operating a program of similar size/scope, supervising youth in a similar setting, conducting youth assessments, case planning, de-escalation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The agency failed to respond to all the questions. • Responses are unclear and lack depth, or do not demonstrate the agency's capacity to address the requirements of the project. • The agency provides inadequate information about the project and/or there may be some question about how the proposed project fits with the existing status of the juvenile facility within the jurisdiction or how the project fits within the overall continuum of care. • The agency describes an inadequate local stakeholder input process. • The agency does not describe capabilities and competencies that to point toward success • The agency does not provide evidence of having the program experience necessary to run a successful SRCCCY, including working with adolescents, operating a program of similar size/scope, supervising youth in a similar setting, conducting youth assessments, case planning, de-escalation • The agency does not include an adequate work plan and timeline.

<p>youth assessments, case planning, de-escalation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The agency includes a detailed work plan and timeline. The agency provides a detailed staffing plan that appears to provide robust and continuous supervision of youth. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The agency provides a staffing plan that appears to provide adequate and continuous supervision of youth. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The agency includes a work plan and timeline, but the work plan does not have adequate detail or appears unrealistic. The agency provides a staffing plan that lacks detail or that may not provide for enough staff to provide adequate and continuous supervision of youth. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The agency does not provide a staffing plan that will provide adequate and continuous supervision of youth.
---	---	--	---

Section 1.6 Program Sustainability	Rating Scale	Possible Points
<p>A. Describe in detail how the SRCCCY and proposed programming/services will be sustained, including a projected daily rate, use of Youth Aids (if applicable), funding from the county or tribe, fees for youth in other counties, and other funding sources for ongoing program costs. Provide any plans related to repurposing the facility for future use.</p>	<p>Excellent: 71-90 Very Good: 51-70 Good/Fair: 31-50 Poor: 30 or below</p>	<p>90</p>

Benchmarks			
<p>Excellent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All information requested is clearly provided. The agency has considered how the SRCCCY and proposed programming/services will be sustained and has a viable plan for sustainability. The agency has included a projected daily rate, use of Youth Aids (if applicable), available funding from the county or tribe, fees for youth in other counties, and/or other funding sources for ongoing program costs and demonstrates that it has available funding sources for ongoing program costs. Revenue, expenditure, and daily rate calculations are detailed and reasonable based on the information available. The agency has considered plans related to repurposing the facility for future use and has strong options for repurposing in future. 	<p>Very Good</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All information requested is provided. The agency has considered how the SRCCCY and proposed programming/services will be sustained and has a viable plan for sustainability. The agency has included a projected daily rate, use of Youth Aids (if applicable), available funding from the county or tribe, fees for youth in other counties, and/or other funding sources for ongoing program costs and demonstrates likely ability to maintain funding for ongoing program costs. Revenue, expenditure, and daily rate calculations are provided and appear to be reasonable based on the information available. The agency has considered plans related to repurposing the facility for future use and has some options for repurposing in future. 	<p>Good/Fair</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most information requested is provided. The agency has considered how the SRCCCY and proposed programming/services will be sustained; however, the agency does not provide specific, detailed information about how the SRCCCY and proposed programming/services will be sustained. The agency has included a projected daily rate, use of Youth Aids (if applicable), available funding from the county or tribe, fees for youth in other counties, and/or other funding sources for ongoing program costs and demonstrates some ability to maintain funding for ongoing program costs. Limited revenue, expenditure, and daily rate calculations are provided but appear to be reasonable. The agency has considered plans related to repurposing the facility for future use but lacks realistic option for repurposing in future. 	<p>Poor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The agency failed to respond to all the questions, responses are unclear and lack depth, or do not demonstrate how program will be sustained. The agency does not provide information about how the SRCCCY and proposed programming/services will be sustained. The agency has not included a projected daily rate, use of Youth Aids (if applicable), available funding from the county or tribes, fees for youth in other counties, and/or funding sources for ongoing program costs. Revenue, expenditure, and daily rate calculations are lacking or do not appear to be reasonable. The agency has not considered plans related to repurposing the facility for future use.

Section 1.7 Evidence of Local Support	Rating Scale	Possible Points
<p>A. Attach letters of support from local stakeholders, to include local judges, school districts, county boards, and other relevant stakeholders in support of this proposal.</p>	<p>Excellent: 71-90 Very Good: 51-70 Good/Fair: 31-50</p>	<p>90</p>

B. If letters of support are not available or have not yet been submitted, the applying county/tribe may include a narrative describing proactive work to gather local support.	Poor: 30 or below	
---	-------------------	--

Benchmarks			
<p>Excellent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multiple letters of support from relevant stakeholders are attached, and include letters from local judges, school districts, county boards, and other relevant stakeholders. 	<p>Very Good</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multiple letters of support from relevant stakeholders are attached, but do not include letters from all relevant stakeholders. If letters of support are not available or have not yet been submitted, the agency has included a detailed narrative describing proactive work to gather local support. 	<p>Good/Fair</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some letters of support from relevant stakeholders are attached, but do not include letters from all relevant stakeholders. If letters of support are not available or have not yet been submitted, the agency has included a minimal narrative describing proactive work to gather local support. 	<p>Poor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The agency did not include letters of support from relevant stakeholders and did not include a narrative describing proactive work to gather local support.

Section 2.0 Wisconsin Model of Youth Justice	Rating Scale	Possible Points
<p>A. Approach incorporates and is consistent with Wisconsin model of youth justice. The Wisconsin model should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Be developed in an inclusive manner that incorporates input from youth and families, community stakeholders, mental health and physical health practitioners, experts in juvenile justice and trauma-informed care, and all others who wish to come to contribute to the goal of juvenile justice in Wisconsin. Focus on prevention and diversion and provide accountability and services to youth and families in the system that prepares them to thrive (“DCF Youth Justice Vision and Strategic Plan”). Recognize that the post-dispositional secure custody of youth (Type 1, MJTC, SRCCYs) is one component of the broader youth justice system and should only serve youth who require correctional placement. Promote a collaborative system where the state agencies, county and local providers work together to enhance program effectiveness and minimize duplication of services. Prioritize evidence-based practices that have proven outcomes that serve youth in smaller, regional facilities that are closer to the communities and foster engagement with their families to promote a successful transition home. Promote youth and family voice and involvement with a strengths-based, culturally responsive approach that builds toward self-sufficiency through wraparound services. Value community engagement and community safety, both in the short term and in the long term. Ensure healthy, safe, and fair environments for the youth in secure custody and the staff who serve them, including the elimination of racial and ethnic disparities. Require that all youth in secure custody receive evidence-based, trauma-informed, and developmentally appropriate programming and services designed to meet their assessed risk and needs. Integrate best practice to collect, maintain, and analyze data to assess performance and improve outcomes for youth and families. Prioritize the successful and sustained transition for youth from the system immediately upon their reentry to prevent and reduce recidivism based on objective data. Promote community supervision that is evidence-based, trauma-informed and considers the needs of youth and their families. Enable those in care and their families to provide feedback as they exit the system to ensure future data-based decision making. 	<p>Excellent: 201-250 Very Good: 126-200 Good/Fair: 51-125 Poor: 50 or below</p>	<p>250</p>

Benchmarks			
<p>Excellent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The grant application exemplifies the principles outlined in the Wisconsin model of youth justice. 	<p>Very Good</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The grant application demonstrates consistency with the principles outlined in the Wisconsin model of youth justice. 	<p>Good/Fair</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The grant application is generally consistent with all or most of the 	<p>Poor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The grant application appears to be inconsistent with the principles outlined in the Wisconsin model of juvenile justice.

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The application clearly demonstrates that the proposed SRCCY has strong potential to play a key role in moving the state forward with juvenile corrections reform that is part of a broader youth justice system improvement.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The application shows that the proposed SRCCY has potential to move the state forward in juvenile corrections reform.	<p>principles outlined in the Wisconsin model of youth justice</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The application may lack sufficient detail to determine how the proposal aligns with the principles or how the SRCCY will fit in with broader reform efforts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• It is unclear how or whether the proposed SRCCY will advance juvenile corrections reform in Wisconsin.
---	---	--	--

DRAFT