

GULFSTREAM GOODWILL INDUSTRIES, INC. - PROGRAM EVALUATION OBJECTIVE CHART

| PROGRAM: Employment Services | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|------------------------|---|------------------------------------|----------------------|
| OBJECTIVE | MEASURE | WHO APPLIED TO | TIME OF MEASURE | DATA SOURCE | TARGET / BENCHMARK | RESULTS 2019 |
| Results of Services (Effectiveness): | | | | | | |
| Maximize participant satisfaction | Number of participants satisfied with services | All participants completing program | At exit from program | Quality Assurance Survey or telephone follow-up interview | Average rating of 4 on a 1-5 scale | North 4.3, South 4.1 |
| Service Access | | | | | | |
| Maximize # successfully placed into community employment | Number of participants who obtain a community based job | All participants who are job placed | At job placement | ETO Placement Report | 400 | 370 |
| Resources Used (Efficiency): | | | | | | |
| Minimize time in program | Number of days in program before placement | All Employment Services participants successfully completing program | At job placement | ETO Placement Report | 90 Days | 113 Days |
| Satisfaction Persons Served (Experience) | | | | | | |
| Maximize earnings of participants successfully job placed | Average hourly wage of those job placed | All participants who are job placed | Wage rate at placement | ETO Placement Report | \$9.00 | \$10.84 |
| Satisfaction of Stakeholders (Experience) | | | | | | |
| Maximize referral agent satisfaction | Number of referral agents satisfied with services | All referral agents | Annually | Quality Assurance Surveys | Average rating of 4 on a 1-5 scale | 3.3 South, 3.8 North |
| Business Function Indicator | | | | | | |
| Maximize employer satisfaction | Number of employers satisfied with services | All employers | Annually | Quality Assurance Surveys | Average rating of 4 on a 1-5 scale | 4.1 |

GULFSTREAM GOODWILL INDUSTRIES, INC. - PROGRAM EVALUATION OBJECTIVE CHART

Analysis of Results

Strengths:

The Employment Programs are Person Centered Programs which works to highlight participant assets and strengths. Additionally, the programs work to meet the needs of the employer as well to strengthen business partnerships.

Impact of Extenuating/Influencing Factors:

A Community Needs Assessment was conducted in 2019 and the agency shifted focus and sunsetted Employment Services with the intent to re-group in a more efficient manner. This showed a slight decline in services during the 4th Quarter as participants were served to the conclusion of their case.

Comparative/Competitive Performance:

Wages earned of the participants show a comparison of \$9.00/hr to an average earning of \$10.84/hr. This is ahead of a potential minimum wage increase for the State of FL.

Emerging/Sustaining Trends and Causes:

Participant time in program shows an upward trend of 113 days, a 23 day measure over the target (90 days). The hiring economy has become competitive and candidates are waiting longer for hiring decisions.

Areas Needing Improvement:

Satisfaction of referral agent was noted as needing improvement.

Action Plan to Address Improvements Needed:

In order to build more rapport with referring counselors, monthly meetings were implemented to discuss overall participant progress in the South region. This also is an opportunity to market the programs and meet new staff.

Results of Prior Actions Plans Implemented:

The Employment Model added Case Managers to assist in services to allow the Employment Consultants to focus on job placements and networking with community employers. While the model partially was successful, it wasn't financially sustainable.

GULFSTREAM GOODWILL INDUSTRIES, INC. - PROGRAM EVALUATION OBJECTIVE CHART

| PROGRAM: Supported Employment | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|-----------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|-----------------|
| OBJECTIVE | MEASURE | WHO APPLIED TO | TIME OF MEASURE | DATA SOURCE | TARGET / BENCHMARK | RESULTS 2019 |
| Results of Services (Effectiveness): | | | | | | |
| Maximize participant satisfaction | Number of participants satisfied with services | All participants completing program | At exit from program | Quality Assurance Survey or telephone follow-up interview | Average rating of 4 on a 1-5 scale | 4.2 |
| Service Access | | | | | | |
| Maximize % of persons who retain employment | % of persons employed 6 months or longer | All persons placed in Supported Employment | 6 months after initial employment | Personnel Records | 70% | 50% |
| Satisfaction Persons Served (Experience) | | | | | | |
| Maximize # of persons served | Number of persons employed in S.E. or Community Contracts | All employees in S.E. or Community Contracts | Annually | Personnel Records | 150 | 58 |
| Business Function Indicator | | | | | | |
| Maximize referral agent satisfaction | Number of referral agents satisfied with services | All referral agents | Annually | Quality Assurance Surveys | Average rating of 4 on a 1-5 scale | 3.6 |
| Maximize employer satisfaction | Number of employers satisfied with services | All employers | Annually | Quality Assurance Surveys | Average rating of 4 on a 1-5 scale | 4.1 |

GULFSTREAM GOODWILL INDUSTRIES, INC. - PROGRAM EVALUATION OBJECTIVE CHART

Analysis of Results

Strengths:

Program strengths of our Supported Employment department are participant and employer satisfaction ratings. Both rated at 4.2 and 4.1 out of 5 and above the target of 4.

Impact of Extenuating/Influencing Factors:

A Community Needs Assessment was conducted in 2019 and the agency shifted focus and sunsetted Employment Services with the intent to re-group in a more efficient manner. This showed a slight decline in services during the 4th Quarter as participants were served to the conclusion of their case.

Comparative/Competitive Performance:

Prior year Referral Satisfaction rates were 3.8 for standard Employment and Supported Employment is noted at 3.6. The department continued to hold monthly progress meetings with stakeholders to secure feedback.

Emerging/Sustaining Trends and Causes:

Quality satisfaction levels support an upward trend.

Areas Needing Improvement:

Retention rates are noted as lower than the 70% target.

Action Plan to Address Improvements Needed:

Additional funding for Follow Along services has been sought to provide services after the 180th day of successful employment; this in the past has been an unfunded service and isn't sustainable long-term.

Results of Prior Actions Plans Implemented:

The Employment Model added Case Managers to assist in services to allow Employment Consultants to focus on job placements and networking with community employers. While the model partially was successful, it wasn't financially sustainable.

GULFSTREAM GOODWILL INDUSTRIES, INC. - PROGRAM EVALUATION OBJECTIVE CHART

| PROGRAM: Residential | | | | | | |
|---|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|-----------------|
| OBJECTIVE | MEASURE | WHO APPLIED TO | TIME OF MEASURE | DATA SOURCE | TARGET / BENCHMARK | RESULTS 2019 |
| Results of Services (Effectiveness): | | | | | | |
| Maximize participant satisfaction | Number of participants satisfied with services | All participants completing program | At exit from program | Quality Assurance Survey or telephone follow-up interview | Average rating of 4 on a 1-5 scale | 4.6 |
| Service Access | | | | | | |
| Minimize time to housing | Average time from program intake to housing | All participants who are housed | Measured upon entering housing | Client Track | 10 days | 3.5 Days |
| Satisfaction Persons Served (Experience) | | | | | | |
| Maximize earnings of participants successfully job placed | Hourly wage of those job placed | All participants who are job placed | At placement into employment | Client Track | \$9.00 | \$10.65 |

GULFSTREAM GOODWILL INDUSTRIES, INC. - PROGRAM EVALUATION OBJECTIVE CHART

Analysis of Results

Strengths:

Minimizing the wait from program entry until placed in housing stands at just under 4 days on the average. This score is ahead of GGI's 10 day goal. The Residential Services team continues to see strong client service rating at 4.6 for 2019.

Impact of Extenuating/Influencing Factors:

Staff turnover may be an extenuating factor but the current staff remain consistent.

Comparative/Competitive Performance:

Perhaps creating a higher wage target in the near future to be competitive with possible increase in minimum wage.

Emerging/Sustaining Trends and Causes:

All targets are currently sustainable.

Areas Needing Improvement:

Based on current report, the overall data are trending above targets; no improvements needed.

Action Plan to Address Improvements Needed:

N/A

Results of Prior Actions Plans Implemented:

N/A

GULFSTREAM GOODWILL INDUSTRIES, INC. - PROGRAM EVALUATION OBJECTIVE CHART

| PROGRAM: Transitions | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|-----------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------|
| OBJECTIVE | MEASURE | WHO APPLIED TO | TIME OF MEASURE | DATA SOURCE | TARGET / BENCHMARK | RESULTS 2019 |
| Results of Services (Effectiveness): | | | | | | |
| Maximize participant satisfaction | Number of participants satisfied with services | All participants in program | Annually | Quality Assurance Surveys | Average rating of 4 on a 1-5 scale | 4.6 |
| Service Access | | | | | | |
| Maximize % of persons in Supported Employment | % of persons who transfer to services with an EC or start work in the community | All participants in program | Annually | ETO | 10% | 10% |
| Resources Used (Efficiency): | | | | | | |
| Maximize % of persons achieving goals that align with Support Plan Outcomes | % of persons who complete PDP goals related to Support Plan goals | All people in Program 3 months or longer | Annually | Monthly PDP Progress Reports | 80% | 80% |
| Satisfaction Persons Served (Experience) | | | | | | |
| Maximize referral agent satisfaction | Number of referral agents satisfied with services | All referral agents | Annually | Quality Assurance Surveys | Average rating of 4 on a 1-5 scale | N/A |

GULFSTREAM GOODWILL INDUSTRIES, INC. - PROGRAM EVALUATION OBJECTIVE CHART

Analysis of Results

Strengths:

The Transitions program is a Person Centered Program that highlights a participant's assets and strengths.

Impact of Extenuating/Influencing Factors:

The Quality Assurance department was eliminated in 2019 and thus the Quality Assurance results for Referral Agent were not secured.

Comparative/Competitive Performance:

The review of the 2019 targets versus the results show consistency in meeting or exceeding goals and outcomes.

Emerging/Sustaining Trends and Causes:

Supported Employment and Maximizing Support Plan goals continue to trend upward for 2019; additionally participant satisfaction is noted as 4.6 out of 5.

Areas Needing Improvement:

An area needing improvement is Quality Assurance, the collection and analysis of the data.

Action Plan to Address Improvements Needed:

Reorganization of the Quality Assurance department and hiring of a staff person to ensure accurate data and reporting.

Results of Prior Actions Plans Implemented:

Prior to 2019, the Quality Assurance department provided quarterly and annual reports for all Human Services departments.

GULFSTREAM GOODWILL INDUSTRIES, INC. - PROGRAM EVALUATION OBJECTIVE CHART

| PROGRAM: Re-Entry BTAF | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| OBJECTIVE | MEASURE | WHO APPLIED TO | TIME OF MEASURE | DATA SOURCE | TARGET / BENCHMARK | RESULTS 2019 |
| Results of Services (Effectiveness): | | | | | | |
| Minimize criminal behavior of program participants | % of participants who are not convicted of a crime while in the program | All participants who were enrolled in the program | At the end of the program year | RENEW & ETO Data Base, Master List | less than 40% | 33.78% 25 of 74 youth served received a new charge while enrolled in the program |
| Service Access | | | | | | |
| Maximize participants who complete goals while enrolled in program | % of participants who complete 75% of their goals while enrolled | All participants who enrolled in the program during grant year | At the end of the program year | RENEW & ETO Data Base, Master List | 50% | 56.77% 42 of 74 youth completed 75% of their goals while enrolled in the program |
| Satisfaction Persons Served (Experience) | | | | | | |
| Maximize participant satisfaction | Number of participants satisfied with services | All participants completing program | At exit from program | Quality Assurance Surveys | Average rating of 4 on a 1-5 scale | 4 |

GULFSTREAM GOODWILL INDUSTRIES, INC. - PROGRAM EVALUATION OBJECTIVE CHART

Analysis of Results

Strengths:

Seasoned case managers and good community partnerships for resources

Impact of Extenuating/Influencing Factors:

Good opportunities for resources with our community partners and sharing ideas and looking at things we can do better in the future.

Comparative/Competitive Performance:

Youth who remained in the program and complete their goals was due to the case managers using motivational interviewing skills to engage and encourage youth to complete their goals for their own personal success.

Emerging/Sustaining Trends and Causes:

Parents not involved with youth, working too much to support family means the parent is not home for long periods of time leaving youth to have a lot of unsupervised time and lack of structure at home.

Areas Needing Improvement:

Parent involvement with youth's success.

Action Plan to Address Improvements Needed:

Create parent sessions to assist parents in obstacles and barriers

Results of Prior Actions Plans Implemented:

Parents were interested in attending sessions but many times were not able to make it due to lack of transportation or time raising a family.

GULFSTREAM GOODWILL INDUSTRIES, INC. - PROGRAM EVALUATION OBJECTIVE CHART

| PROGRAM: Intensive Home Detention | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|------------------------------------|---|
| OBJECTIVE | MEASURE | WHO APPLIED TO | TIME OF MEASURE | DATA SOURCE | TARGET / BENCHMARK | RESULTS 2019 |
| Results of Services (Effectiveness): | | | | | | |
| Minimize criminal behavior of program participants | % of participants who are not convicted of a crime while in the program | All participants who were enrolled in the program | At exit from program | Justice Services Logic Models, Annul CBA Reports& ETO Data Base, Master List | 80% | 95.45% 84 of 88 youth did not obtain a new charge while enrolled in the program |
| Maximize % who complete program successfully | % of participants who complete the program successfully | All participants who have actively participated in the program | At exit from program | Justice Services Logic Models, Annul CBA Reports& ETO Data Base, Master List | 70% | 84.09% 74 youth successfully completed the program out of 88 |
| Service Access | | | | | | |
| Minimize additional contact with the criminal Justice system | # of participants who do recidivate | All participants enrolled in the program | end of program-this includes youth who have enrolled but did not exit the program yet | Dashboard Report | 70% | 85.71% 84 of 98 |
| Satisfaction Persons Served (Experience) | | | | | | |
| Maximize participant satisfaction | Number of participants satisfied with services | All participants completing program | At exit from program | Quality Assurance Surveys | Average rating of 4 on a 1-5 scale | 4.5 |

GULFSTREAM GOODWILL INDUSTRIES, INC. - PROGRAM EVALUATION OBJECTIVE CHART

Analysis of Results

Strengths:

Community collaboration. Committed case managers to monitor the youth and motivate them to stay focused on productive things in the community and at home to avoid further interaction with Department of Juvenile Justice DJJ.

Impact of Extenuating/Influencing Factors:

Changes to the method in which the youth was measured to be eligible for the program in the middle of the year.

Comparative/Competitive Performance:

This year was split between the judge making a court decision on the placement of the youth after they have touched the criminal justice system and the new measurement tool DRAI that would give them a score and the judge would use the to consider the placement of the youth (community or DJJ facility).

Emerging/Sustaining Trends and Causes:

The new DRAI gave a more equal result of the youth's placement based on a score. This meant the youth was released directly from court in most cases to IHD and in some cases would not go back to the DJJ facility which allowed us the opportunity to do the intake with the parent and the youth before release.

Areas Needing Improvement:

Working with DJJ to get a more rapid notification of the youth who is being added to case load so an intake can take place right after release from the facility/court. Working with parents to complete the intake once the youth is released as they parents are often working when the case manager comes to the house.

Action Plan to Address Improvements Needed:

Case managers will go to a parents place of employment (if the parent agrees) to complete their portion of the intake packet.

Results of Prior Actions Plans Implemented:

This allowed us to complete the documents more timely.

GULFSTREAM GOODWILL INDUSTRIES, INC. - PROGRAM EVALUATION OBJECTIVE CHART

| PROGRAM: Adult Reentry | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|----------------------|--|--------------------|---|
| OBJECTIVE | MEASURE | WHO APPLIED TO | TIME OF MEASURE | DATA SOURCE | TARGET / BENCHMARK | RESULTS 2019 |
| Results of Services (Effectiveness): | | | | | | |
| Maximize % who complete program successfully | % of participant who complete the program successfully without recidivating | All participants who have actively participated in the program | At exit from program | Dashboard Report from RENEW data base, ETO and Master List | 70% | 70.01% 39 of 55 of the participants that exited the program completed successfully without recidivating |
| Service Access | | | | | | |
| Maximize % who complete personal objectives | % of participants who complete the 75% of their PDP objectives | All participants who participated in the program | At exit from program | Personal Development Plans (PDP) & RENEW (county database for reentry program) | 70% | 70.01% 39 participants completed 75% of their goals on the PDP upon exit |

Analysis of Results

Strengths:

Seasoned Case Managers in the reentry field working with clients, supportive funder and collaborations with community partners.

Impact of Extenuating/Influencing Factors:

New system to track participants in a community database created inaccurate information when pulling reports from this source.

Comparative/Competitive Performance:

We kept internal data and reports in order to have accurate information

Areas Needing Improvement:

Better database that is used by the county to collect data and provide reports.

Action Plan to Address Improvements Needed:

Working with county and outside community partner to begin to analyze how the data base can be improved

Results of Prior Actions Plans Implemented:

County working to determine how to do an evaluation of the software currently used for Reentry.