5-9-2017

A Comparative Program Analysis of the Safe and Successful Youth initiative in the Massachusetts' Gateway Cities of Brockton and New Bedford

Adam J. Costa

Follow this and additional works at: http://vc.bridgew.edu/honors_proj

Part of the Political Science Commons

Recommended Citation

Copyright © 2017 Adam J. Costa

This item is available as part of Virtual Commons, the open-access institutional repository of Bridgewater State University, Bridgewater, Massachusetts.
A Comparative Program Analysis of the Safe and Successful Youth initiative
in the Massachusetts’ Gateway Cities of Brockton and New Bedford

Adam J. Costa

Submitted in Partial Completion of the
Requirements for Commonwealth Honors in Political Science

Bridgewater State University
May 9, 2017
I. Acknowledgements

This research was supported by the Bridgewater State University Honors Program, the Bridgewater State University Political Science Department, the Bridgewater State University Office of Undergraduate Research, the New Bedford Police Department, the Brockton Police Department, United Way of Greater New Bedford, and the Old Colony YMCA of Brockton. I would like to thank everyone I interviewed, and this research would not have been possible without the hard work and dedication of local public administrators, the police, and these local nonprofit organizations.

I have to express my deepest appreciation to my mother and father for sharing their pearls of wisdom and unwavering support during the course of this research and my education at Bridgewater State University. I owe them everything. I am grateful to Dr. Teresa King and Amy Couto of the BSU Honors Program for their friendship, support and inspiration. I will never forget their sincere dedication to improving the lives of BSU students. I am thankful for my thesis directors Dr. Melinda Tarsi and Dr. Kevin Donnelly who provided their expertise and guidance that greatly assisted my research which improved this manuscript significantly.
Table of Contents

I. Acknowledgements 3
II. Abstract 5

III. Problem Definition 6
   a. Introduction 6
   b. Gateway Cities 7
   c. Geographic-Based Structural Violence 9
d. Historical Context of Youth Violence Reduction Policies in Massachusetts 12
   i. Operation Ceasefire: The Boston Gun Project 14
   ii. The Shannon Grant Community Safety Initiative 15
   iii. The Safe and Successful Youth Initiative 17

IV. Methodology 18
   a. Research Method and Research Questions 18
   b. Most Similar Systems (MSS) 20
   c. Logic Model Evaluation Method 26
d. Limitations 27

V. Safe and Successful Youth Initiative Program Design 29
   a. Program Model 29
      i. Eligibility & Identification 30
      ii. Outreach & Case Management 32
      iii. Behavioral Health Services, Education, Occupational Training/ Employment Services 33

VI. Logic Model Evaluation & Analysis 35
   a. SSYI Logic Model Evaluation 35
   b. Hypotheses Analysis 37

VII. Conclusions 40
   a. Effectiveness 40
   b. Efficiency 42
   c. Equity 43
d. Conclusion & Further Research 44

VIII. Works Cited 47-49
IX. Appendices 50-62
II. Abstract

In the summer of 2016, I participated in an internship with the Massachusetts Department of Correction Program & Reentry Services Division. I worked with state policy analysts to research and implement new reentry program initiatives in state facilities. The responsibility of these state employees was to identify key areas of research and evaluate program effectiveness through statistical analysis. I learned it was possible to compare and contrast public programs through comparative analytical study. The purpose of this honors thesis is to research violence reduction programs under the Safe and Successful Youth Initiative (SSYI) in Massachusetts’ Gateway Cities. This paper will evaluate the effectiveness of SSYI programs to better understand how these programs affect victims, violent offenders, and youth violence within Massachusetts’ Gateway Cities. The paper will introduce a brief description of gateway cities and the evolution of the SSYI. This paper will discuss the methodology of choosing Gateway Cities, and why certain cities were selected for this research project.

Furthermore, the paper will define the problem statement and identify research indicators within the comparative program analysis. This paper will then compare and contrast public program data to show the effectiveness of inputs, resources, outputs, and outcomes of the SSYI public programs selected in the Gateway Cities. This paper will conclude with the overall findings of the research, and it will indicate policy recommendations in specific cities. This paper provides a third-party analysis of current public programs focused on reducing youth violence, to provide a method for evaluating these public programs and to identify positive and negative externalities associated with these public programs. After evaluation, the conclusion of the study found that SSYI programs in Brockton and New Bedford are achieving desired results and success within their outlined program theory.
III. Problem Definition

Introduction

The role of the public administrator is to promote the public’s welfare or the common good. Public policy becomes the course of action through which the public administrator addresses the problems of constitutes, changes human behavior through regulatory processes, and defines the role of government. These actions are to ensure the public’s welfare; however, it is left to the public to determine who and how the government will serve the common good through democratic elections. Michael E. Kraft and Scott R. Furlong (2015) define public policy as, “a course of government action or inaction in response to public problems. It is associated with formally approved policy goals and means, as well as the regulations and practices of agencies that implement programs,” (p. 4). The study of public policy allows for citizens to evaluate the effectiveness of democratic governance, and it improves the public’s ability to understand the externalities of government policies.

Youth mortality rates are important public health indicators for communities when determining the overall quality of life and level of inequality experienced by a marginalized population. Deaths of teenagers and young adults are largely caused by external causes such as accidents, homicide and suicide; these deaths can be reduced through public programs. In the United States, the Centers for Disease Control reported that the second highest cause of death is homicide for youth, accounting for roughly 13 percent of all youth deaths. The risk of dying from homicide among non-Hispanic black male teenagers (39.2 per 100,000 population) is more than twice that of Hispanic males (17.1 per 100,000 population) and about 15 times that of non- Hispanic white males (2.6 per 100,000 population) (Miniño, 2010, p. 4). Minority youth are often exposed to higher levels of juvenile violence in areas with high rates of
poverty/unemployment, lower rates of educational attainment, and lower levels of annual median household income.

Youth violence reduction programs are a tool in public administrators’ toolboxes. These public programs are funded as a larger part of public policy initiatives to provide needed youth services and to promote the public’s overall safety. The SSYI is a violence reduction program that was developed as a targeted approach to youth violence in Massachusetts. The SSYI is currently implemented in many cities that are designated by the Commonwealth as Massachusetts’ Gateway Cities. The program mandates cities to provide specific resources and services; the SSYI system integrates many different partners state-wide in a multilateral approach. The SSYI retains a community-based policing profile; the localized focus allows for the program to adapt to the needs and problems specific to the cities that it serves. A comparative program analysis allows for the SSYI program to be compared and evaluated within these different municipalities. Brockton and New Bedford are both designated as Gateway Cities, and the cities presently receive appropriated funding from the Massachusetts State budget for SSYI programs and resources. The purpose of this paper is to evaluate the effectiveness, efficiency, and equity of SSYI programs in these two Gateway Cities through comparative analysis and a logic model.

**Gateway Cities**

What is a Gateway City, and how did the term originate? How many cities in Massachusetts are defined by this term? Why are youth violence reduction policies targeted in these cities? What demographics constitute the targeted population for the Safe and Successful Youth Initiative and other youth violence reduction programs in these cities? These questions are the foundation for understanding youth violence research within the SSYI programs of
Gateway Cities. Before analyzing data on public programs, it is important to understand the context in which the programs operate.

A good place to start would be to define the socioeconomic characteristics of a Gateway City. The term ‘Gateway City’ was published in a 2007 report, *Reconnecting Massachusetts Gateway Cities: Lessons Learned an Agenda for Renewal*, co-authored by members of the Brookings Institution and the Massachusetts Institute for a New Commonwealth (MassINC). According to the report, the authors’ image of Gateway Cities is of geographic regions that exhibited a strong manufacturing heritage that are located outside of the Greater Boston metropolitan region in Massachusetts. These municipalities are deemed ‘Gateways’ because they are at once gateways to the next era of the state’s economic success and key portals for their diverse, often foreign-born, residents’ ongoing pursuit of the American dream (Muro et al, 2007, p. 11). In 2009 and 2010, the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts incorporated a legislative definition for a “Gateway City” into Massachusetts General Laws. The legislative definition (2009-2010) states: “Gateway municipality, a municipality with a population greater than 35,000 and less than 250,000 with a median household income below the commonwealth's average and a rate of educational attainment of a bachelor's degree or above that is below the commonwealth's average (Section 3A of Chapter 23A of the General Laws of Massachusetts). Initially, the Brookings Institute and MassInC report outlined eleven cities that fit these criteria: Brockton, Fall River, Fitchburg, Haverhill, Lawrence, Lowell, New Bedford, Pittsfield, Springfield, and Worcester. With updates to census data since 2007, this list expanded quickly to incorporate 26 communities in total with updated U.S. Census Bureau data in 2013. The following cities are defined by the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and listed online by the Executive Office of Housing and Economic Development (EOHED) as
Gateway Cities: Attleboro, Barnstable, Brockton, Chelsea, Chicopee, Everett, Fall River, Fitchburg, Haverhill, Holyoke, Lawrence, Leominster, Lowell, Lynn, Malden, Methuen, New Bedford, Peabody, Pittsfield, Quincy, Revere, Salem, Springfield, Taunton, Westfield, and Worcester.

With a greater understanding of the term ‘Gateway City’, it is crucial to understand why the Brookings Institute and MassInk brought attention to these economic and geographic locations. The 2007 report stipulates that Massachusetts’ Gateway Cities have failed to fully participate in the state’s economic revival to a technological and knowledge-based economic turnaround. According to this report, “Faced with the waning of traditional manufacturing, entire communities once highly dependent of traditional industries yet without strength in the newer knowledge economy — places such as New Bedford, Lawrence, and Springfield — continue to struggle with the shift from the old order to the new,” continuing with, “Once economic powerhouses in their own right, they have lost their centrality as engines of the middle-class prosperity and upward mobility,” (Muro et al, 2007, p. 9-10). Consequently, an uneven economic system developed between these 11 Gateway Cities and Greater Boston Region-deemed the “Knowledge Core” of more than 75 communities encircled around Boston (see Appendix A – Massachusetts’ Gateway Cities & the Greater Boston Knowledge Core).

**Geographic-Based Structural Violence**

By establishing how Gateway Cities are defined and the general demographics of their populations, a conceptual foundation forms explanations as to why Massachusetts targets violence reduction efforts in these cities. In a lecture titled, *Of Other Spaces: Utopias and Heterotopias*, Michel Foucault addresses space’s theoretical relationship with human culture and human activity patterns. Foucault (1967) argues the following in his lecture:
Cities shape the fate of human beings just as much as human beings shape the fate of cities. This concept is crucial for understanding why violence reduction efforts are targeted in many Gateway Cities. Cities develop in the presence of geographic surroundings, shapes, scales, and other properties. According to Ross and Foley (2014), “A poorly maintained property decreases the perception of guardianship and increases the perception that crime is tolerated,” (p. 12). People use these spaces, certain connections grow out of everyday interactions, and then these spaces become places that hold specific and personal meaning. If a youth’s geographic surroundings are abandoned buildings in economically distressed areas, then physical and social neglect become their environment.

Human culture and human systems are derived from place and space. Xiangming Chen, Anthony M. Orum, and Krista E. Paulsen explore people’s connection to cities in their book, *Introduction to Cities: How Place and Space Shape Human Experience*. The sense of community and the social connections that exist in places create a high degree social capital, meaning that communities exist with mutual support, trust, and friendship. Furthermore, a sense of tight community bonds and trust lead to a feeling of security, allowing for citizens to feel safe and permanently settle down. According to Chen, Orum, and Paulsen (2013):

The cities in which we live, as well as our neighborhoods, affect our material wellbeing and our security. In large part, places also provide – or deny – access to social, educational, and economic opportunities. While all social scientists take care to balance individual and societal factors when seeking to understand people’s life chances, we can say with confidence that much of a person’s success or suffering can be explained by looking where they live. (p. 25)
This brings into the larger discussion whether or not a person exerts free choice in their life, or if they live their life influenced by the resources around them that exist beyond their control.

Massachusetts’ Gateway Cities are not defined by rates of violent crimes; as previously stated, these regions are defined by legislation in terms of economic, educational and population based statistics. However, Gateway Cities are also identified by policymakers as regions within Massachusetts where the highest volume of violent crime occurs.


According to Peters (2013), “The ten Massachusetts communities with the highest volume of violent crime in 2012 (in declining order) are: Boston, Worcester, Springfield, Brockton, New Bedford, Fall River, Lawrence, Lynn, Chelsea, and Lowell. The majority of these communities are the most populous cities within the Commonwealth and also have poverty levels that exceed both the state and national averages (10.7% and 14.3%, respectively).” Every city mentioned here—excluding Boston—is legally defined as a Gateway City based on the factors identified by the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

The report incorporates a regional chart that shows the distribution of all reported violent crime in Massachusetts in 2012; violent crime rates were calculated by the cumulative number of murders, forcible rapes, robberies, and aggravated assaults (see Appendix D – Distribution of the volume of all reported violent crime in the Commonwealth during 2012). The cities with the highest volumes of crime are labeled in a deep purple in Peters’ report; the regions
with high volumes of crime overlap Gateway Cities if one was to visually overlay this map with the map of Massachusetts’ Gateway Cities & the Greater Boston Knowledge Core (see Appendix A & Appendix D). It becomes apparent that highest volumes of violent crimes are perpetrated in Gateway Cities. Since, Gateway Cities report that there is a lower median household income and lower rate of educational attainment, it stands to reason that these areas would proliferate the underlying conditions associated with high volumes of violent crime, including juvenile crime.

**A History and Context of Youth Violence Reduction Policies in Massachusetts**

Massachusetts’ violent crime data follows national trends in juvenile crime from the late 1980s to the present. Peter W. Greenwood and Susan Turner (2011) attribute the national influx of youth homicides and drug-related violence in the early 1990s, “to the introduction of crack cocaine in the mid-1980s, the disorganized street markets through which it was sold, and the recruitment of young minority males to do most of the street-level selling. They argue that increased involvement in dangerous street-level drug markets led many of these [youths] to arm themselves, initially for protection, which in turn led many of their peers to also engage in defensive arming,” and continuing with, “the end result was a much higher rate of homicide and aggravated assault among this population,” (p. 92). Massachusetts’ Gateway Cities remain regions where high volumes of violent crimes and drug-related homicides are reported today.

Since the reported peak in the early 1990s, there have been clear national and state-level decreases in the volume of juvenile violence and violent crimes. Within the same period, Massachusetts’ youth violence reduction polices developed significantly over the years since the 1990s. The state is a national leader in combating violent crime through use of evidence-based programs and its investment in front-end prevention programs. Programs are
becoming more comprehensive by creating partnerships across many non-profits, local agencies and state-wide departments. Although the decline in violent and juvenile crime rates may not be unique to Massachusetts, the results have been dramatic. According to Peters (2013), “The most recent year of complete available data – 2012 – revealed that the volume of violent crime within the Commonwealth (26,819) had fallen 3% from the previous year and 18%,” and she continues by adding, “violent crimes declined 33% from the peak of 40,239 offenses in 1993 and are presently below levels from some four decades ago,” (p. 3). The most current data on violent crime victimization rates in Massachusetts was reported by the American Institutes for Research in the article, *The Impact of the Safe and Successful Youth Initiative (SSYI) on City-Level Youth Crime Victimization Rates*. At the time of the report, the trend in violent crime victimization of youth (ages 14-24) in SSYI-funded cities is on a steady decline (see Appendix E – Violent Crime Victimization Rate).

The Safe and Successful Youth Initiative developed as youth violence reduction policy directed by the Executive Office of Health and Human Services (EOHHS). The SSYI did not arrive on the Massachusetts policy landscape out of thin air; SSYI is a result of experience and knowledge gathered though previous state-funded programs. An acutely defined problem, favorable politics, and evidence-driven policies opened a policy window for SSYI within the same time period. This phenomenon of agenda setting is studied to understand how and why some public policies develop while others never come to fruition. According to John Kingdon (2003), “Problems are brought to the attention of people in and around government by systemic indicators, by focusing events like crises or disasters, or by feedback from the operation of current programs,” and he goes on to add, “the separate streams of problems, policies, and politics come together at certain critical times. Solutions become joined to problems, and both of
them are joined to favorable political forces” (p. 19-20). This idea of a primordial policy soup explains how public programs may be initially generated.

However, successive developments in public programing follows timelines of periods of jumps and step-level changes instead of constant incremental change; otherwise known as the punctuated equilibrium, this model of policy change was developed by Frank Baumgartner and Bryan Jones in 1993. SSYI’s inception can be understood following the gradualist evolution of the “three streams” model coupled with punctuated equilibrium. SSYI’s initial conception was based on over 20 years of experience and development by addressing youth violence by creating a series of sequential grants and programs. Programs today include more behavioral health, substance abuse treatment, education, and employment skills training aspects. Previous initiatives focused more emphasis on deterrence or suppression with more oversight initially from police departments.

*Operation CeaseFire: The Boston Gun Project*

Policymakers addressed the rising rate of youth gun violence by targeting gang leaders and known individuals through the Boston Gun Project. This was a problem-oriented policing initiative expressly aimed at taking on a serious, large-scale crime problem: homicide victimization among youths in Boston. Authors of the report, *Strategies to Prevent Urban Violence* (2013), described Operation CeaseFire as, “a law enforcement and community partnership designed to address the vicious cycle of revenge and retribution leading to incidents of increasingly serious violence, by confronting offenders with the consequences of their actions and providing an exit strategy from criminal activities by offering employment and social/human service support,” (Campie et al, 2013, p. 19). By “pulling levers,” authorities were throwing the
book at known perpetrators of violent crimes and deterring low level offenders as a method to
discourage gang involvement on all levels. According to Walker (2015),

The strategy of “pulling levers” involved using all potential violations by the
targeted gang leaders, from the most serious crimes, such as gun crimes, to the
least serious, such as motor vehicle law violations. The levers included arresting
people with outstanding warrants, seizing the unregistered vehicles, and
vigorously enforcing probation and parole conditions. Probation or parole status
is a particularly useful lever because many gang members have prior convictions
and are out on probation or parole. (p. 115).

Like many large cities in the United States, Boston experienced an epidemic of
youth homicide between the late 1980s and early 1990s. Homicide among persons ageing 24
and under increased by 230 percent—from 22 victims in 1987 to 73 victims in 1990—and
remained high well after the peak of the epidemic. Boston experienced an average of 44 youth
Operation CeaseFire follows Kingdon’s three streams model of agenda setting; the problem was
a large increase in youth gun homicide deaths, and the public called on legislators to respond to
the problem, and a policy was developed to address public outcry. The policy implemented by
the city of Boston in early 1996 had two main elements: a direct law enforcement attack on illicit
firearms traffickers supplying youths with guns and an attempt to generate a strong deterrent to
gang violence. This program existed concurrently with significant decreases in the gun homicide
rate, and researchers determined there existed a correlation with the timeline of implemented
programs and the decrease in the gun homicide rate amongst youths.

The Shannon Community Safety Initiative

The Massachusetts Legislature has appropriated funds to support the
Massachusetts’s Shannon Community Safety Initiative (Shannon CSI) in an effort to suppress
gang violence across the Commonwealth since 2006. Shannon CSI is a state grant program
administered by the Executive Office of Public Safety and Security (EOPSS). Shannon Grant funds have been used to support regional law enforcement operations, hire outreach workers, fund job training programs, and support after school programs in many cities and towns that are struggling with youth violence. SSYI draws much of programmatic philosophy from the Shannon Grant, and these two grants often operate in conjunction with one another to address violence within Gateway Cities.

The Shannon CSI is a state grant program and is a considerable escalation from the law enforcement based policies of Operation Ceasefire; the grant resembles an incremental step-up in policy — this evolution in public policy is following the punctuated equilibrium model. According to former Boston Mayor Menino’s report (2011), “Shannon Grant Community Safety Initiative uses a multidisciplinary data driven approach that balances the elements of prevention, intervention and enforcement to target gang-related youth firearm violence in violent hotspots,” and also adding, “a successful collaboration balancing City, community faith, and law enforcement partnerships and continues to work with regional law enforcement and multi-disciplinary partners on a comprehensive strategy that builds on best practices learned” (p. 9)

The Shannon CSI increased the community participation of Operation Ceasefire into its main programmatic agenda, and currently the EOPSS expects to award up to $5.3 million in 2017 with grant allocations.

Dr. Robert French, Associate Director of NorthStar Learning Centers in New Bedford, was the primary author of New Bedford’s first grant proposal for Shannon Community Safety Initiative funding back in 2006. Dr. French identifies the focus of the Shannon CSI grant as an, “opportunity to mount a focused, coordinated, comprehensive response to this complex, multifaceted problem. With the Police Department as the lead agency, our proposed plan will
call upon these agencies and groups to implement a combination of interrelated intervention, suppression, and preventative strategies to reduce youth gang violence,” (p. 3). Dr. French constructed a program matrix that identifies the responsibilities and services provided by the partnering stakeholders. The police department acts as the lead agency of the grant, but the combination of five interrelated intervention and prevention strategies in the Shannon CSI is divided across partnering non-profits with in the city. The Shannon CSI prevention strategies include: community mobilization, gang suppression, social intervention, opportunities provision, and organizational change.

The Safe and Successful Youth Initiative

In May 2011, Governor Deval Patrick’s administration announced the start of the Safe and Successful Youth Initiative. Eleven Cities—Boston, Brockton, Chelsea, Fall River, Holyoke, Lawrence, Lowell, Lynn, New Bedford, and Springfield—were selected for state-level SSYI funding in 2011 and started implementing the program by 2012. This public program was implemented with state grant funding and with oversight from the Massachusetts Executive Office of Health and Humans Services (EOHHS). SSYI and Shannon CSI often work in conjunction with each other in the same cities across the Commonwealth; both programs are comprised of a set of complex relationships between the state departments, local law enforcement, and non-profit agencies.

Shannon CSI is a targeted approach on gang involvement and suppression with grant funding controlled by the EOPSS; local oversight comes from city police departments as lead agencies. SSYI, however, uses a different structure than Shannon CSI with grant funding controlled by the Executive office of Health and Human Services. SSYI works with local law enforcement, but places oversight with a non-profit organization as the lead agency within the
city. Although there are variations across sites, there are some components that are mandatory and must be included in each SSYI program at the city level. These mandatory line items include:

The identification and referral of persons, aging between seventeen and twenty-four years old, who are a proven risk as a victim or perpetrator of crimes involving firearms, gangs, and drug-related violence; the use of outreach or case workers to find these young men, assess their current needs, and act as brokers for services to address unmet needs; and the provision of a continuum of comprehensive services including education, employment, and intensive supervision (Pestrosino et al, 2014, p. 7).

SSYI is structured as a program that provides educational opportunities, employment/occupational training, and behavioral health services to local youth who are identified as victims or as a proven-risk to the safety to themselves or the community. It is an important to note that there is a separation from law enforcement and partnering agencies; SSYI is not intended as another gang suppression policing tool. Although SSYI targets is services targets gang members, the program is a service based platform that works with police to identify potential proven-risk individuals for service, resources, and treatment. SSYI is meant to affect change in communities by addressing the underlying causes of violent crime.

IV. Methodology

Research Method & Research Questions

A research method must be established for choosing certain cities to study before beginning a comparative program analysis on the evidence-based SSYI programs within Massachusetts’ Gateway Cities. The independent variables in question are the innate demographics—median household income, educational attainment rate, and the amount of appropriated SSYI funding granted to participating Gateway Cities. This study employs a nonexperimental design as it is interested in the independent variables of Gateway Cities
Nonexperimental designs are said to be reflexive, or to have the property of reflexivity, meaning that all parts of the research process occur simultaneously and influence each other. Another way to think about this is that the research process is nonlinear and iterative, and the lessons learned from each iteration inform the next iteration. (p. 108)

Experimental units cannot be randomly assigned to participating SSYI program in Brockton and New Bedford. This nonexperimental design suffers from weak internal validity because there is no control group for a comparable baseline. Individuals cannot be excluded from the study, and group assignments are predetermined for participants based on the city they reside. This means both observed and unobserved characteristics can be due to chance rather than systematic factors. This implies that it may not be possible to show causality between independent and dependent variables, because there remain too many variables unaccounted for in this experiment.

A previous study, *The Impact of the Safe and Successful Youth Initiative (SSYI) on City-Level Youth Crime Victimization Rates*, in 2014 addressed the following research question in a quasi-experimental design: What is the impact of SSYI on monthly city-level violent crime victimization rates (per 10,000 citizens) for persons ages 14-24?; What is the impact of SSYI on monthly city-level aggravated assault victimization rates (per 10,000 citizens) for persons ages 14-24?; What is the impact of SSYI on monthly city-level homicide victimization rates (per 10,000 citizens) for persons ages 14-24? (Pestrosino et al, 2014, p. 1-2).

However, this study would like to focus on the following research question to compare the effectiveness, efficiency, and equity of the SSYI between the Gateway Cities of Brockton and New Bedford: Why are Massachusetts’ Gateway Cities experiencing different levels of measured success between similar SSYI programs? This study’s research hypotheses
are as follows: (1) Massachusetts’ Gateway Cities will experience higher levels of measured success with SSYI program’s educational enrollment if there is a higher the education attainment percentage per capita in that Gateway region. (2) Massachusetts’ Gateway Cities will experience higher levels of measured success with SSYI program’s employment services if there are higher median household incomes in the Gateway City region. (3) Massachusetts’ Gateway Cities will experience higher levels of measured success with SSYI program’s casework engagement levels if there is an increase in SSYI state funding in Gateway City regions.

Most Similar Systems (MSS)

The logical framework of Most Similar Systems (MSS) was selected to identify city case studies that share economic, educational, and population-based demographics. Therefore, the number of experimental variables is limited when choosing Gateway Cities that have the SSYI fully implemented. While MSS is used as an analysis tool often on the nation-state level of comparative studies, there is a growing practice to employ this technique on the micro-level of comparative public policy. According to Przeworski and Teune (1970), if such a difference is found among the systems studied, the following theoretical implications follow: (1) The factors that are common to the countries [Gateway Cities] are irrelevant in determining the behavior being explained since different patterns of behavior are observed among systems sharing these factors. (2) Any set of variables that differentiates these systems in a manner corresponding to the observed differences of behavior (or any interaction among these differences) can be considered as explaining these patterns of behavior (p. 34). Even if some differences can be identified to hold causality in relationships, the efficiency of this strategy is relatively limited.
All Massachusetts’ cities can be considered “similar” because they are all from one state within the same country, but this study would be inherently flawed if just any cities were chosen at random. Using the MSS design, it is possible to narrow the selection of cities. This study narrows the possible selection range by placing a domain on the economic, educational attainment rates, and population size demographics within the designated cities. A method used to narrow the selection was the choice to study Massachusetts’ Gateway Cities. As stated in chapter one, the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts narrowly defines a Gateway City as a municipality with the following criteria: (1) a population greater than 35,000 and less than 250,000, (2) a median household income below the state average, and (3) a rate of educational attainment of a bachelor’s degree or above that is below the state average (Section 3A of Chapter 23A of the General Laws of Massachusetts).

According to the Census ACS 1-year survey, the current median household income for Massachusetts is $70,628. Real median household income peaked in 2008 at $71,997 and is now $1,369 (1.90%) lower. From a peak low of $66,246 in 2011, real median household income for Massachusetts grew by $4,382 (6.61%). By simply looking at the poverty statistics, it is known that 30 percent of the state’s working poor live in the Gateway Cities and this level of poverty has remained steady for decades. According to the Brookings Institute and MassINC (2007), “Gateway City households saw their real median income increase by only 10 percent to $40,100 (in 2005 dollars, using a weighted average) between 1980 and 2000, at a time when the Boston Knowledge core enjoyed a 32-percent increase to $67,300 (Muro et al, 2007, pg. 20). The difference in median household income in Gateway Cities will serve as an economic indicator to show differences between the population served by youth violence reduction programs in the SSYI.
Furthermore, the average educational attainment levels of residents with the Gateway City regions are characteristically lower than the Massachusetts’ state average, and thus the rate of educational attainment per capita serves another indicator to compared cities. The Brookings Institute and MassINC (2007) report states, “On the education side, just 16.5 percent of Gateway City Residents and 24.6 percent of Gateway region residents now possess a four-year college degree, compared with the 42-percent Greater Boston mark. Similarly, just 23 and 32.4 percent of Gateway City and Gateway region adults have at least an associate’s degree although 48 percent of Boston knowledge core residents do” (Muro et al, 2007, pg. 21). The statistical data on the educational attainment levels per capita allow us to identify differences within similar cities.

The next step in the selection process was to identify which Gateway Cities received funding from EOHHS for SSYI programs. These overlapping research indicators produced a smaller list of potential SSYI cities including: Boston, Brockton, Chelsea, Fall River, Holyoke, Lawrence, Lowell, Lynn, New Bedford, Pittsfield, Springfield, and Worcester (EOHHS, 2017). The Most Similar System research design produced a refined method for case-study selection of the Massachusetts’ Gateway Cities with SSYI programs and funding. Brockton and New Bedford were selected as case studies. A data analysis of these cities reveals their similarity in research indicators for educational attainment rates, median household income, population size and SSYI funding.

Brockton, Massachusetts, fulfills the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts legislative definition of a Gateway City with a population size of 95,314 people in 2015. MassInk highlights the city with the following online description, “Located 20 miles south of Boston, Brockton was once the nation’s largest shoe producer. Now known as the City of
Champions, after native boxers Rocky Marciano and ‘Marvelous’ Marvin Hagler, Brockton has been recognized recently for outstanding results in urban education,” (MassInk, 2017). I constructed an excel table from the data of a 2015-2016 U.S. Census Bureau online report to illustrate a comparison between the demographics of Gateway Cities and a community in the Greater Boston Knowledge Core (see Appendix B – U.S. Census Bureau Quick Facts). In a 2015-2016 U.S. Census Bureau online report, Brockton’s high school graduation rate for persons 25-years-or-older was recorded at 81.0 percent, only slightly below the state average of 89.8 percent; however, the city only had a Bachelor’s Degree or higher education attainment rate of 17.7 percent which is well below the MA state average of 40.5 percent (see Appendix B – U.S. Census Bureau Quick Facts). Brockton also demonstrates a lower annual median household income averaging $47,557 as compared with $68,563 as an average for Massachusetts median household incomes.

New Bedford, Massachusetts is similarly identified as one of the initial Gateway Cities with a population size of 94,958 in 2015; the city is located even farther south than Brockton from Boston’s economic resources. MassInk remarks about the city with the following description, “During the 19th century, “The Whaling City” was once one of the world’s largest whaling ports as famously portrayed in Moby Dick. Today New Bedford Whaling National Historic Park is all that remains of that industry, by the city is still home to one of the nation’s largest commercial fishing fleets and a lively arts scene,” (MassInk, 2017). In a 2015-2016 U.S. Census Bureau online report, New Bedford’s high school graduation rate for persons 25-years-or-older was recorded at 71.5 percent, and the city had a Bachelor’s Degree or higher education attainment rate of 15.9 percent (see Appendix B – U.S. Census Bureau Quick Facts).
Additionally, New Bedford had a lower annual median household income with an average of $37,574 compared to Brockton.

To put these numbers in perspective, New Bedford’s and Brockton’s demographics were compared with the educational attainment rates of persons over the age of 25-years-or-older and the average median annual household income of Newton, Massachusetts. According to the U.S. Census Bureau’s 2015-2016 online report, Newton had a population of 88,817 people, a high school graduation rate of 97.4 percent and a Bachelor’s degree or higher education attainment rate of 76.6 percent for persons aging 25-years-or-older (see Appendix B – U.S. Census Bureau Quick Facts). Newton graduated significantly more high school students, and roughly had five times the number of college graduates in 2015 compared to Brockton or New Bedford. The 2015-2016 census online report also indicated that the average median annual household income for Newton was $122,080, nearly triple the average annual median income of a household in New Bedford. Lastly in 2015, the poverty rate in Newton is at 5.1 percent while Brockton and New Bedford suffer from high poverty rates that were respectively 18.6 percent and 23.4 percent.

One correlation that develops here is that as the rate of annual median household income decreases, there is a decrease in the overall educational attainment rates in both high school and higher education. Furthermore, lower levels of education attainment are found among minority communities in Gateway Cities. The authors of the 2007 Brookings Institute and MassInk report make an important comment, “…nearly one million Bay Staters, after all — 15 percent of the state’s population, one-quarter of its immigrants, one-third of its poor people — live in these 11 cities (Muro et al, 2007, pg. 10). The 2015-2016 U.S. Census Bureau online report also included the percentage of persons living in poverty between the three communities:
Brockton, New Bedford, and Newton. Brockton. Not surprisingly, Newton has 5.1 percent of the population living in poverty while Brockton and New Bedford have higher rates of poverty at 18.6 percent and 23.4 percent (see Appendix B – U.S. Census Bureau Quick Facts). Another important demographic distinction recorded by the U.S. Census is with race demographics. The Census Bureau’s statistics also illustrate the race demographics found in Gateway Cities. When compared with Newton, both Brockton and New Bedford recorded a significantly lower percentage of persons who identify as White and a higher percentage of persons who identify as Black or African American, Hispanic, American Indian, Alaskan Native or Native Hawaiian, or mixed race; the only category where Newton recorded a higher minority population was with Asians (see Appendix B – U.S. Census Bureau Quick Facts). When compared to the Greater Boston Knowledge Core, Gateway Cities’ regions are where higher majorities of minorities are settling down, lower levels education attainment are recorded, and higher levels of poverty exist.

It is also noteworthy to mention, public administrators in both Brockton and New Bedford were enthusiastic to participate when called upon for research interviews. These Gateway Cities are also local in terms of their distance to Bridgewater State University, and many BSU students are from these cities or these Gateway regions. As is often the case, it is all about who you are connected to in politics; many of my connections for interviews and data collection came from student relationships with public administrators in these two cities. Furthermore, Bridgewater State University has more name recognition in the South Coast and Brockton area than in outlying regions such as Pittsfield, Haverhill, Springfield, and/or Worcester; public administrators from these regions were readily available and more sympathetic towards this research project. In practical terms, Brockton and New Bedford were selected
initially with the MSS design in mind, and were the final case studies selected for this study due to a combination of practical reasons.

**Logic Model Evaluation Method**

The next step is identifying a method for logical and practical program evaluation for SSYI programs in these Gateway Cities. A *logic model* is a plausible and sensible model of how a program will work under certain environmental conditions to solve identified problems (Bickman, 1987). Put simply, a logic model is an easy method for communicating the structure of a program and the program’s performance standards. The linear structure of a logic model indicates a cause-and-effect relationship between a program’s elements in a clear and concise manner. The elements of the logic model are resources [inputs], activities [public programs], outputs, short-term outcomes, intermediate outcomes, and long-term outcomes (Wholey, 1987). An example of a basic logic model was developed in the *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation* (see Appendix F – Basic Logic Model).

A logic model for the SSYI would involve identification of resources from both the state and local level; this would include the annual budget information, and financial breakdown of the grant among the partnering organizations. Activities would be defined by the Gateway City’s SSYI programs and the services or resources each program offers to participants. Outputs would be the immediate resources received by SSYI participants, but other outcomes would be evaluated over periods of time with the scope of the outcome expanding until the overall problem of youth violence was “reduced” by a statistical significant margin. According to McLaughlin and Jordan (1994), “Assumptions about resources and activities and how these are expected to lead to intended outcomes are often referred to as *program theory*. A logic model is a useful tool for describing program theory. The hypothesis, often implicit, is that if the
right resources are transformed into the right activities for the right people, then these are expected to lead to the results the program was designed to achieve,” (p. 60). SSYI’s *program theory* would follow that increased funding, educational opportunities, employment/occupational training, and behavioral health services are expected to lead to an overall reduction in violent juvenile crime in these cities.

After developing a logic model, the next step is to perform a program evaluation to access why certain levels of performance-outputs and outcomes-were observed. In other words, a program evaluation is testing the effectiveness, efficiency, and equity of the *program theory*. A *theory in practice* is developed which underlines how a program must be enhanced or redesigned to reach a higher level of success-which is defined by the program’s theoretical target to solve an identified and defined public problem. Furthermore, McLaughlin and Jordan (1994) emphasize, “What is essential is the testing of the program hypotheses through impact evaluation. Even if the evaluator observes that intended outcomes were achieved, the following question must be asked: What features, if any, of the program contributed to the achievement of intended and unintended outcomes?” (p. 74). In essence, we are determining whether the program in working, and identifying if programs should be restructured to achieve desired results.

**Limitations**

Due to the nature of this research and the safety of individuals that are affected by violent crime, I have included an explanation regarding why some information will be withheld from publication. It would be counterproductive, dangerous, and ultimately irresponsible to discuss the detailed operations of any violent crime reduction programs. Therefore, ground operations will not be discussed, but the objectives or goals of programs will be discussed in
subsequently evaluation. For the security and privacy of affected individuals, I will not discuss individuals by name, specific locations of program service centers, or divulge any public administrators who are involved in working directly with victims or with individuals receiving services from such programs. Any persons working directly with SSYI individuals receiving service will be recognized only by the title of their public office position, and if an interviewer their name will be used in relation to the citation of that interview. I will only release information that is already open to the public through online public forums or through previously released publications.

The Massachusetts Executive Office of Health and Human Services made their position clear that they could not release any data that would divulge personal details or personal information of any persons, or release the financial breakdown of grants in relation to violent crime reduction programs. I will adhere to these policies as well. Similar limitations were discussed by the authors of American Institutes for Research report on SSYI (2013), “Reviews like this may suffer from lack of access to information that is not publicly available, which is why key experts were interviewed from practice, policy, and research fields to supplement information that is in the public sphere,” (Campie et al, p. 27). To overcome these limitations, I used a common triangulation method to gain multiple perspectives during the research phase. This method involved dozens of interviews with local public administrators, and interviews with public officials from the police departments of Brockton and New Bedford. I also performed elite or key interviews with the executive directors of the partnering non-profit agencies to understand the services and resources provided by the SSYI (see Appendix G – SSYI Interview Questions). Furthermore, I obtained historical documentation from the Commonwealth’s online databases that indicated program outcomes reported by EOHHS. Lastly, I reviewed published
evaluations by the American Institutes for Research and WestEd researchers to gain a perspective on previous SSYI program evaluations.

V. Safe and Successful Youth Initiative Program Design

Program Model

The Safe and Successful Youth Initiative (SSYI) is operated out of the Executive Office of Health and Human Services (EOHHS). In a Grantee Handbook created by the EOHHS (2017), the SSYI program is clearly outlined by the following program definition,

SSYI requires the implementation of a coordinated intervention strategy between local law enforcement and community providers focused on proven-risk youth, and specifically young men identified by each city as the proven risk individuals for being perpetrators or victims of shooting or stabbing violence. Specifically tailored to address gaps and needs, each SSYI City supports a continuum of services that includes: street outreach and engagement, needs assessment and evaluation, intensive case management, mental health counseling, and employment and education services and supports. (p. 4).

The SSYI program design follows a public health model, and it is not intended to be used to increase gang suppression activities. This model mirrors the idea of problem-oriented crime policy (POCP), a policing theory developed by Professor Herman Goldstein thirty years ago. POCP studies a problem, analyzes data, develops an appropriate response, then adapts solutions by assessing the overall impact. Walker (2015) explains, “POP holds that the police should quit thinking about crime as a single undifferentiated phenomenon and instead break it down into specific components: commercial robberies, household burglaries, graffiti, open-air drug dealing, nuisance disorders, and so on. Each one is different, with different degrees of seriousness, different causes, and different impacts on individuals and neighborhoods. And each one requires a different response,” (p. 7-8). Problem-oriented policing (POP) places less emphasis on responding to symptoms of crimes by identifying and addressing the underlying causes of criminal acts.
SSYI is the epitome of POCP; instead of simply being tough on crime, the program is designed to provide services and resources to a targeted population with the objective of suppressing the root causes of violent crime. In fact, there are a separation of responsibilities that have clearly defined the roles of partnering organizations. According to Anthony Falvo (2016), “The police department acts as the financial agency overseeing the SSYI grant money appropriated to the city and they help in the referral process of individuals; a few years ago, the lead agency was changed from police department to a non-profit which changed the grant’s association,” (A. Falvo, Phone, November 17, 2016). The tiered model of SSYI illustrates how police initially identify and refer proven-risk individuals for SSYI operations. The police share a referral list of individuals with a lead agency, often a non-profit organization, within the city. These lead agencies overview and manage contracted non-profits organizations to provide: street outreach, needs assessment evaluations, intensive case management, mental health counseling, employment services, and educational support (see Appendix H – SSYI Program Model).

**Eligibility & Identification**

There are certain qualifications that the SSYI program uses to identify and assess the eligibility of an individual. First and foremost, the SSYI Grantee Handbook (2016) stipulates, “While, the Executive of Health and Human Services is aware that there are a number of young women who may fit this definition as well, the focus of the Safe and Successful Youth Initiative is on proven-risk young men, as research has demonstrated that it is young men who disproportionately drive violent incidents at a statistically significant level,” (p. 5). Identification is led by local law enforcement, and the partnering organizations must work with the police department, detective divisions, gang units, and regional intelligence units to properly identify and vet proven-risk young men. SSYI has predefined eligibility requirements that include male
individuals aging 17-24 years old who currently resides in the community or is expected to be released from incarceration. According to a report on Worcester Massachusetts by Ross and Foley (2014), the arrest rates for youth offenders spike for violent crimes among 17-24 year olds (see Appendix I – Arrest Totals by Age in Three Crime Types in Worcester, MA, 2009-2012). These individuals must fulfill two out of the five following qualifications to receive SSYI support: (1) Repeatedly engages in weapons violence or crimes against persons; (2) Was a victim of weapons violence or crimes against persons; (3) Engages in high volume drug-related criminal activity; (4) Is in a leadership role in gang or street violence (5) Is currently residing in a SSYI program region (EOHHS, 2016, p.5). A referral list is constructed with the names of eligible participants for the SSYI program.

These referral lists are updated in Offender I.D. meetings that are held twice a month with the cities’ partnering SSYI organizations and the police department. Furthermore, any individual, or family member, can refer themselves to the SSYI program by speaking with authorities in a police station, but they may not be eligible if they do not meet the program’s criteria. Sergeant Lopez of the Worcester Police Department committed, “What sets SSYI apart from other violence reduction programs is the fact that this is a list-driven program. Once someone is identified as a proven-risk individual they remain indefinitely on this list unless the individual is incarcerated for more than two years, ages-off the list, moves to another city, or passes away. This is not like Shannon CSI, the SSYI referral list is a permanent list of the proven-risk members of the local community,” (M. Lopez, Phone, November 28, 2016). The SSYI referral lists are different from programs like Shannon CSI where at-risk individuals receiving services can drop-in and drop-off. The vetting process ensures a higher likelihood that individuals will be engaged in SSYI programs, however SSYI still remains voluntary for youth
(they aren’t mandated to participate in these programs). Outreach workers and caseworkers must then build close relationships with these youths to enroll them in SSYI programming.

**Outreach & Case Management**

The second and third step of the SSYI program model are outreach and client case management services. It is at this juncture that the lead agency is designated responsibility for finding the SSYI clients through outreach and preforming case management activities with the identified youth. According to Amanda Wall, the SSYI law enforcement liaison of the Budget & Finance Division of the Lawrence Police Department (2016), “Once the police department hands over the referral list it’s up to the lead agency to first contract with a service providers to perform outreach and case management for these individuals,” (A. Wall, Phone, November 17, 2016). As outlined by the EOHHS (2016), “Outreach (or street) workers are specialized staff members who establish preliminary relationships that form the pipeline into more extensive services,” adding, “Outreach worker, while not case managers, are positive adult role models for young people and can help them overcome setbacks or make positive choices,” (p. 6). The main issue that arises at this stage in the program model is the initial contact with persons identified as proven-risk SSYI individuals. If an individual can be located, a delicate process of trust building meetings proceeds, and often it takes several meetings for outreach workers to get an individual into the SSYI program. Outreach workers are encouraged to meet outside of an individual’s neighborhood at a neutral location to allow for the individual to feel secure and to ensure the safety of the outreach worker.

A SSYI client (proven-risk individual) is assessed for their needs, and an Individual Service Plan (ISP) is drafted based on an evaluation of their education history, work history, family situation (including whether they are parenting), and mental health or psychiatric
needs. Case managers are in constant contact with SSYI clients, and they ensure that an ISP adapts to a client’s changing needs with recurrent assessments. The EOHHS (2016) describes the case managers’ role as, “the primary points of contact for the various service streams that wrap around the young man. Case managers must focus on ensuring that youth feel actively engaged in the decisions that are being made about their lives and encourage them to move towards self-determination,” (p. 6). The relationships built between case managers and SSYI clients are crucial for the success of proven-risk youth, because case workers ensure that all partnering agencies have updated and relevant information about the SSYI client to coordinate the appropriate program services.

**Behavioral Health Services, Education, & Occupational Training/ Employment Services**

As part of its program model, SSYI lead agencies are required to contract with a Licensed Mental Health Clinic to provide skilled trauma therapy and cognitive behavioral therapy. The Grantee Handbook by EOHHS (2016) explains, “Behavioral Health Services should be trauma-informed, directly addressing underlying problems that can lead to violence, such as anger management, substance abuse, depression, or post-traumatic stress disorder,” and it also states, “Behavioral services must be offered in a safe therapeutic environment. The program must track and maintain records of client attendance in behavioral health services,” (p. 6-7). SSYI programs offer one-on-one services, group therapy, peer support groups, and even substance abuse services.

A high school or college level education is often cited by educational professionals as the key to a career and higher income. Baseline education assessments of SSYI clients are completed during their initial meetings with case workers. Educational services are structured to support a client’s efforts towards a high school diploma, the GED or Hi-SET
equivalents, and higher education attainment. SSYI staff must also provide non-standard educational service opportunities, such as one on one tutoring, customized learning plans, evening classes, or connections to credit recovery programs (EOHHS, 2016, p. 7). SSYI clients receive educational services as part of their specific ISP, and these services are tailored with their needs in mind.

The last component of the SSYI Program model is occupational training and employment services. These services include: occupational training, transitional employment, and assistance with obtaining unsubsidized employment. Lieutenant Melo of the New Bedford Police Department discussed how partnerships with local employers gave SSYI clients a second chance to build their career skills, “These young men have the opportunity to go work at high paying jobs like in the New Bedford fishing industry as longshoremen, and this opens their world up to paths they never thought they could achieve. We have a few great stories where our SSYI employment resources were the start for these individuals,” (Melo, Personal Interview, March 5, 2017). The idea behind employment resources is to eventually build a SSYI client’s job skills to a degree where they can become employed, self-sustaining and a productive member of society.

EOHHS (2016) offers a description of the subsidized employment placements in its SSYI Grantee Handbook, “Subsidized employment opportunities supported with SSYI funding may be provided for up to 18 months for each client. Clients participating in Subsidized Employment supported with SSYI funding may not work more than 30 hours per week,” (p. 8). Now, some might look at this funding as a waste of tax payer dollars for this type of service, but as it turns out SSYI resources may create a net benefit in societal factors that later saves public funds. In fact, the March 2017 SSYI Annual report cited a cost-benefit analysis finding that for every dollar invested in the Springfield and Boston programs, there was a societal cost savings of as
much as $7.35 (EOHHS, 2017, p. 7). This may not hold true for the remaining SSYI programs in other Massachusetts’s Gateway Cities, but it is an encouraging example that shows these SSYI components provide needed services with promising results.

VI. Logic Model Evaluation & Analysis

SSYI Logic Model Evaluation

A logic model table was created to evaluate the program theory of SSYI programs in Brockton and New Bedford (see Table 1 – Logic Model Table for SSYI Gateway Cities New Bedford & Brockton). The first column in the logic model lists the inputs & resources for SSYI programs; the listed inputs are investments in human capital, including: staff knowledge, research, & program development. Furthermore, the 2017 Massachusetts state budget displays the EOHHS line-item budget with $6,560,000.00 reserved for SSYI operating costs. New Bedford’s SSYI operating budget for 2017 is $350,000.00; Brockton’s SSYI budget for 2017 is equivalent at $350,000, however this increased from the city’s previous appropriation of $125,000 in the first half of 2016. The mandated SSYI program components are listed under the activities column of the logic model table; these items include: outreach, casework, education, behavioral health services, and employment services.

These program components are coordinated by the United Way of Greater New Bedford and the Old Colony YMCA of Brockton, which are the lead agencies for these two SSYI programs. Additionally, the lead agencies contract out for services, and under the outputs column of the logic model the contracted partnering organizations are listed next to the services they provide for the SSYI programs. New Bedford’s SSYI outreach & case management components are handled by Positive Action Against Chemical Addiction (PAACA). The education and employment components are handled by PACE YouthBuild, a non-profit
organization which provides education, counseling and job skills to unemployed young American adults, generally high school dropouts. New Bedford’s SSYI behavioral health services are handled by Child and Family Services, who “have staff that is bilingual and bi-cultural, specializing in adult, child, and geriatric psychiatry,” (Child and Family Services, 2017). In addition, Brockton’s SSYI outreach and casework is handled by its lead agency, the Old Colony YMCA; furthermore, the lead agency provides behavioral services with the fully licensed Old Colony Y Mental Health Clinic. The YMCA partners with PACE YouthBuild, and the Brockton Housing Authority BHA to provide education and transitional employment subsidies.

**Table 1: Logic Model Table for SSYI Gateway Cities New Bedford & Brockton**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Logic Model Table for SSYI Gateway Cities New Bedford &amp; Brockton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inputs (Resources)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MA State 2017 SSYI Grant Funding</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Bedford/United Way Funding</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Old Colony YMCA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding $350,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavioral Health</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment Services</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**External Context:** New Bedford SSYI Active Client # = 54-56/ Brockton SSYI Active Client # = 40
New Bedford = Pop. Size: 94,958; Median Household Income: $37,574; High School/ College Graduation %: 71.5/ 15.9
Brockton = Pop. Size: 95,314; Median Household Income: $47,557; High School/ College Graduation %: 81.0/ 17.7
Short-term, intermediate, and long term outcomes are broken down by the five program component areas. These outcomes combined are the multiplying forces behind SSYI’s program theory: increased funding, educational opportunities, employment/occupational training, and behavioral health services are expected to be key to an overall reduction in violent juvenile crime in these cities. In the short term, increased SSYI budgets can fund more outreach and case workers can be hired to engage these proven-risk young men. More funding allows for larger building spaces, and more internal programs can be developed to accommodate more classroom resources. However, in the long-term this means higher percentages of proven-risk young men will be enrolled for services, and have closer relationships with their mentors as one-on-one services become more available. Education services provided Hi-Set (GED equivalent) support, tutoring and evening classes. In the long-term, educational services provide SSYI clients with human capital and this can be translated into a higher level of employability. Behavioral health services provide counseling, anger management, and medical resources; later on, these services are seen as crucial to help SSYI clients work through their emotional responses to stressors, and these young men will hopefully develop managing skills over years of therapeutic treatment. Lastly, transitional employment subsidies provide SSYI clients with a source of income to stop them from turning to nefarious activities; in the long run, employment services provide youth with job experience, and eventually this will lead to self-sustaining career and productive life.

**Hypotheses Analysis**

As previously stated in section four, this study answers the research question: Why are Massachusetts’ Gateway Cities experiencing different levels of measured success between similar SSYI programs? The measurements of success for SSYI programs are outlined in the SSYI Annual Report (2017) with a chart that provides metrics with a target benchmarks.
These target benchmarks include: 85% of young men from SSYI list who have been contracted by Outreach staff, 30-60% of young men from SSYI list who enroll in the program receive case management, 80% enrolled young men receiving needed education services, 80% of enrolled young men offered transitional employment services, and 50% of enrolled young men access behavioral health services (see Appendix J – Performance Targets Fiscal Year 2016).

According the SSYI annual report, New Bedford recorded 44 young men as proven-risk youth on the city’s SSYI referral list, and Brockton recorded 40 young men (see Appendix K – Outcomes and Findings for Calendar Year 2016). The study’s first research hypotheses states: (1) Massachusetts’ Gateway Cities will experience higher levels of measured success with SSYI program’s educational enrollment if there is a higher the education attainment percentage per capita in that Gateway region. When compared to New Bedford, Brockton has a higher education attainment rate for both high school (81.0%) and college (17.7%) for persons aging 25-years-or-older (see Appendix – B). Brockton’s SSYI program reports that less than 10 (less than 25%) of total SSYI clients were enrolled in education programs in 2016. New Bedford’s SSYI program recorded 17 (39%) of total SSYI clients enrolled in education programs. This means that our SSYI program data does not show hypothesis one to be valid in these case studies; Gateway City’s educational attainment rates do not show a correlation with corresponding SSYI programs educational enrollment metrics. More SSYI case studies are needed to test the validity of this hypothesis.

The study’s second research hypothesis states: (2) Massachusetts’ Gateway Cities will experience higher levels of measured success with SSYI program’s employment services if there are higher median household incomes in the Gateway City region. Brockton has a higher median household income rate at $47,557 when compared to the median household income rate
of $37,574 in New Bedford (see Appendix – B). In the 2017 SSYI annual report, Brockton’s SSYI program recorded that less than 10 (less than 25%) of total SSYI clients were enrolled in subsidized or unsubsidized employment services. New Bedford’s SSYI program recorded 15 (34%) of total SSYI clients enrolled employment services. This means that our SSYI program data does not show hypothesis two to be valid in these case studies; Gateway City’s median household income does not show a correlation with corresponding SSYI programs employment services enrollment metrics. More SSYI case studies are needed to test the validity of this hypothesis.

The study’s second research hypothesis states: (3) Massachusetts’ Gateway Cities will experience higher levels of measured success with SSYI program’s casework engagement levels if there is an increase in SSYI state funding in Gateway City regions. Massachusetts provides a copy of the Commonwealth’s state budget in the Massachusetts Executive Office of Administration and Finance online archives. Within the state budget, there is a line-item break down to show how funds were appropriated to different offices and programs. Based on this data, it is possible to build a table that indicates the budget for the Executive Office of Health and Human Services (EOHHS) and the line-item funds for the SSYI from fiscal years 2012 to 2018 (see Appendix L – Budget: Office of the Secretary of Health and Human Services).

The budget indicates that from FY2015 to FY2016 there was a 31.09 percent increase in SSYI funding from 4.6 million to 6.030 million dollars; similarly, there was another increase 8.09% (6.56 million total) in FY2017. Tim Lynch, the executive director for the Old Colony YMCA, reported, “In 2015, Brockton’s SSYI program had 25 young men enrolled, but by 2016 our count was up to 40 individuals and our targeted goal is to engage 60 young men by the end on June 2017,” (T. Lynch, Phone, April 6, 2017). New Bedford reported 44 young men
were listed as “proven-risk” in the 2017 SSYI annual report. During an interview, Allison Yates-Berg, the Vice President, Community Impact and Operations at United Way of Greater New Bedford said, “As of right now, New Bedford’s SSYI program there are 53-54 SSYI individuals that are receiving outreach and case management services,” (A. Yates-Berg, Phone, March 6, 2017). Brockton’s and New Bedford’s SSYI program enrollment has increased over the last two fiscal year cycles as the SSYI budgets have also increased.

This means that our SSYI program data does show hypothesis three to be valid within these case studies; an increase in SSYI program funding in Gateway City’s shows a correlation with corresponding increases in SSYI programs enrollment numbers. More SSYI case studies are needed to test the validity of this hypothesis. An interesting side note here is that in FY2018, the proposed budget shows an overall 59.98 percent increase in the EOHHS operating budget, but there is also a 0.91 percent decrease in SSYI funding. It will be exciting to find out if enrollment numbers for SSYI programs are affected by this proposed decrease in funding.

VII. Conclusions

Effectiveness

In 2014, a report was commissioned by the EOHHS to evaluate the impact of the SSYI on city-level youth crime victimization rates. The study employed a quasi-experimental design known as an interrupted time series (ITS) that uses trend data to establish a prediction which was compared to the actual results. The authors of the report state in their conclusion, “The observed effect for the SSYI cities, in relation to the two comparison groups, was statistically significant in all 12 of the main analyses. This means that, all things being equal, it is large enough that we do not believe that chance fluctuation is a good explanation for the
observed results,” (Pestrosino et al, 2014, p. 28). In other words, the observed SSYI programs across the Commonwealth show statistically significant decreases in the volume of reported violent crimes relating to youth crime when compared to other observed groups. This may indicate that the SSYI would score high on any effectiveness rating.

One factor that SSYI does not sufficiently cover is housing for SSYI clients. Through elite interviews from key informants it was uncovered that a significant amount of SSYI clients do not have permanent residence; this means that many young men find themselves homeless or “couch-surfing” between the homes of family and friends. Michele Thibeault, Brockton police department’s Grant Coordinator and Shannon Grant Project Director, stated:

One of the greatest needs for our SSYI population is housing. It becomes difficult to initially enroll and engage SSYI clients when outreach workers cannot find them at a reliable, permanent address. One these men could with their family, or with a friend, or with a girlfriend, and we can never seem to make a solid relationship with them due to this factor. SSYI does not provide housing subsidies for public housing as a service, and so many men find themselves couch surfing until they can find a job to pay for rent (M. Thibeault, Personal Interview, November 22, 2016).

These young men often are on parole, and a permanent address is needed while you on parole, but family disputes can often lead to homelessness. Furthermore, official state records, licenses, and bank documents all need a permanent address for basic paperwork. The very things the majority of the population takes for granted revolves around having a permanent address. Furthermore, it is psychologically unsettling to not have a permanent home, and many youth turn to gang violence as way of finding a “home” or family on the streets.

The New Bedford Police department cited declining violent crime statistics from 2015-2016 as a promising sign that targeted programs for violent crime-including SSYI-were making an impact on the city. The New Bedford NIBRS crime data in the report shows murder and non-negligent manslaughter significantly falling by 40 percent, rape declining 22 percent,
robberies declining 7 percent, and aggravated assault dropping 24 percent (Appendix M – City of New Bedford Police Department Crime Stats 2015-2016). A SSYI outreach coordinator of the New Bedford SSYI program discussed in a research interview that,

SSYI should not only be evaluated by the amount of people who are enrolled an engaged with service programs. We are also making important advances in community trust and safety with the SSYI. The goal at the end of the day is to provide these young men with a way out of their current situation, and they become role models for other disadvantaged people around them. SSYI’s programs act like multiplying factors which create a new environment for our enrolled clients, and we are seeing the more mature and dedicated men complete these services as a result. (Outreach Coordinator, Personal Interview, March 5, 2017).

Regardless of the overall perceived success, the SSYI programs of New Bedford and Brockton still have quite a long way to go to meet the state’s performance targets in June. Public administrators are both SSYI programs are eager develop as New Bedford acquires new programing space and Brockton expands its outreach and casework services.

**Efficiency**

The EOHHS mandates certain services be provided to the enrolled clients of SSYI programs. These mandated services include: street outreach, intensive case management, mental health counseling, transitional employment services, and educational resources. The EOHHS does not mandate which companies can apply as contracted service providers; the only requirement is that a Licensed Mental Health Clinic is contracted as the mental health service provider. The funding for Brockton’s and New Bedford’s SSYI programs are control by the grants and finance divisions of the police departments. New Bedford’s SSYI program is managed by the United Way of Greater New Bedford; United Way then partners with PAACA, PACE YouthBuild, and Child & Family Services.
Whereas, Brockton’s SSYI programs are managed and administered by the Old Colony YMCA for a majority of the services; the Old Colony YMCA partners with PACE YouthBuild and the Brockton Housing Authority. Brockton’s service model houses a majority of its SSYI services under control of the lead agency, and it forms a one-stop-shop for SSYI clients in the YMCA. Furthermore, the YMCA owns gymnasiums, locker room shower facilities, health clinics, and a variety of external resources that SSYI clients receive in additional to their SSYI programs. In practical terms, the SSYI program of Brockton has streamlined administration costs, more external resources for SSYI clients, and enjoys a higher efficiency rating than New Bedford for these reasons.

**Equity**

Women are not the targeted population for SSYI program services. The 2016 SSYI Grantee Handbook does not give enough evidence as to why women should not be allowed to sign up for SSYI services. In fact, the SSYI Grantee Handbook (2016) only stipulates, “While, the Executive of Health and Human Services is aware that there are a number of young women who may fit this definition as well, the focus of the Safe and Successful Youth Initiative is on proven-risk young men, as research has demonstrated that it is young men who disproportionately drive violent incidents at a statistically significant level,” (p. 5). This statement requires some unpacking. It may be justified to target limited resources within specific populations, but it could be possible that this is legalized gender discrimination. The real question becomes how can it be justified that women do not deserve equal access to mental health services, educational resources, and employment subsidies. Although the SSYI allows for any male to apply, public programs by definition should cater to a diverse demographic of recipients who actively reflect the composition of the overall population.
Every male, between the ages of 17-24, who is identified for this program must meet two out of the five following qualifications to receive SSYI support: (1) Repeatedly engages in weapons violence or crimes against persons; (2) Was a victim of weapons violence or crimes against persons; (3) Engages in high volume drug-related criminal activity; (4) Is in a leadership role in gang or street violence (5) Is currently residing in an SSYI program region (EOHHS, 2016, p.5). There might be other violence programs specifically for women, however, women join gangs, women commit crimes with guns, and women sell drugs. It is a fact is that there are female victims and female perpetrators of violent crimes involving guns and drugs, and they should be eligible to apply for these same services as men. It becomes illogical for this program to use gender as a discriminatory measure when selecting SSYI clients. The most vulnerable victims of violent crime are young children and women; the education, employment skills, and mental of both young men and women are affected by exposure to violent crime at a young age. This study finds that Brockton, New Bedford, and every SSYI program in the Commonwealth have low equity ratings for legally allowing for the selection of SSYI recipients to be based on gender.

Conclusion & Further Research

The SSYI programs of Brockton and New Bedford receive a small percentage of the total Massachusetts State Budget. As stated before, independent reports commissioned by the Executive Office of Health and Human Services indicate that these programs significantly reduce the numbers of monthly youth homicides. Additionally, the 2017 SSYI Annual Report provided evidence that the Springfield and Boston SSYI programs save Massachusetts taxpayers on average seven dollars for every dollar spent on programming. These programs do more than save taxpayers’ dollars, these programs target the underlying causes of youth violence as a public
health approach, and they provide male youths an opportunity to become productive and self-sustaining members of society. Through elite interviews and data analysis this paper indicated that with an increase in SSYI program funding, the Gateway city case studies of Brockton and New Bedford experienced increases in levels of engagement and higher levels of SSYI client enrollment. This trend should be analyzed further with data from other SSYI programs to understand if the correlation continues on a statewide level in Massachusetts.

Respectively, research is needed to address the additional externalities associated with SSYI programs. Public programs often affect society with unintended consequences while engaging their intended recipients; it stands to reason that SSYI program services go beyond only benefiting their targeted SSYI clients. For instance, further research is needed to evaluate if SSYI programs lower the recidivism rates of offenders in areas with high volumes of violent crime. These programs are seeing success with higher SSYI client enrollment in education, employment, and mental health services, but more research is needed to understand if these same SSYI clients become statistically less likely to perpetrate violent crimes, and if other offenders are less likely to commit crimes as a result.

In addition, SSYI programs could have wider effects on the children and families who are related to SSYI clients. Domestic violence, incarceration, and substance abuse certainly have an effect on a child’s ability to focus and learn in an academic setting. More research is need to investigate if SSYI program services increase the grade point average of the children who live in the households of SSYI clients. If SSYI can provide a stable home environment for the main figures in the household then children might be able to do better in school, and thus this would become a net benefit for society. If children perform better academically at a younger age, then they may be more likely to attain higher levels of education and secure a prosperous
future. Moreover, additional studies could reveal SSYI programs decrease levels of domestic violence with mental health services, and decrease opioid related overdoses and deaths with substance abuse counselling. SSYI could possibly act as a method to obstruct the poverty-trap many people experience while living in Massachusetts’ Gateway Cities.
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### Appendix B – U.S. Census Bureau Quick Facts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Brockton</th>
<th>New Bedford</th>
<th>Newton</th>
<th>MA State Avg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population estimates, July 1, 2015, (V2015)</td>
<td>96,314</td>
<td>94,858</td>
<td>86,817</td>
<td>8,794,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign born persons, percent, 2011-2015</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate or higher, percent of persons age 25 years+, 2011-2015</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>88.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree or higher, percent of persons age 25 years+, 2011-2015</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income and Poverty</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median household income (in 2015 dollars), 2011-2015</td>
<td>$47,557</td>
<td>$37,574</td>
<td>$32,089</td>
<td>$66,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita income in past 12 months (in 2015 dollars), 2011-2015</td>
<td>$22,231</td>
<td>$21,665</td>
<td>$84,917</td>
<td>$36,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons in poverty, percent</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White alone, percent, April 1, 2010 (a)</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>80.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American alone, percent, April 1, 2010 (a)</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native alone, percent, April 1, 2010 (a)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone, percent, April 1, 2010 (a)</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone, percent, April 1, 2010 (a)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races, percent, April 1, 2010</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino, percent, April 1, 2010 (b)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Areas Highlighted in Orange represent factors decided by the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts legislative definition of a Gateway City 2009-2010

Some estimates presented here come from sample data, and thus have sampling errors that may render some apparent differences between geographies statistically indistinguishable.

Appendix C – Top Ten Communities in Massachusetts by Rate of Violent Crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>2012 Violent Crime Rate</th>
<th>2010 Population</th>
<th>Population Ranking (out of 297 reporting municipalities)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea</td>
<td>1,896</td>
<td>35,177</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brockton</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>93,810</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Bedford</td>
<td>1,083</td>
<td>95,072</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall River</td>
<td>1,074</td>
<td>88,857</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>1,048</td>
<td>153,060</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>1,028</td>
<td>76,377</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>181,045</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holyoke</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>39,880</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincetown</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>2,942</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>617,594</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix D – Distribution of the volume of all reported violent crime in the Commonwealth during 2012
Appendix E – Violent Crime Victimization Rate
Appendix F – Basic Logic Model

BASIC LOGIC MODEL.

Resources (Inputs) → Activities → Outputs for Customers → Short-Term Outcomes (customer benefits) → Intermediate Outcomes (through customers’ changes) → Long-Term Outcomes (problems solved)

Related program logics

Program Structure

Context
External Influences and Related Programs (mediating factors)

Outcomes Structure
Appendix G – SSYI Interview Questions

1. **Inputs:** Is it possible for me to look at the funding proposal that was submitted to the Executive Office of Health and Human Services?

2. **Activity:**
   a. After funding was allocated to the city, is there a formal financial breakdown of the grant, what programs were created?
   b. How much funding was awarded initially?
   c. What was the line-item grant broken down into/ where was the money allocated in the city?
   d. What public, private, or nonprofit organizations are involved with the grant?
   e. How much money was awarded to these organizations?
   f. What did they do with the money, what programs were created?
   g. Was anyone hired to specifically overview this grant?

3. **Outputs:**
   a. How were programs using the SSYI grants evaluated?
   b. Who evaluates these programs?
   c. How many people were eligible per year for these services?
   d. Out of the number of eligibility, how many were served?
   e. Out of the number who were served, how many either voluntarily dropped out or declined service, or were dropped from programs?

4. **Outcomes:**
   a. Calculating the effect of SSYI Grants on the level of Youth Violence between individuals of 17-24 years old.
   b. How is youth violence calculated?
   c. Was there a measurable reduction in youth violence in response to the activity from the SSYI Grants?
Appendix H – SSYI Program Model

SSYI program Model (draft/excerpted)

A. Identification (Police)
   • Identify/verify proven risk youth

B. Outreach
   • Find the youth

C. Case management
   • Enrollment
   • Assessment
   • Service Plan
   • Coordination

D. Education
   • HiSET
   • HS/alt HS enrollment
   • Remedial, tutoring, after-school programs, skills training, ESL, credit recovery
   • other

E. Employment
   • Occupational Training
   • Subsidized Empl.
   • Unsubsidized Empl.
   • Soft Skills
   • other

F. Behavioral Health
   • Connected to Licensed Clinic
   • BH Assessment
   • Clinical Services
   • BH Coordination
   • Trauma Informed
   • other
Appendix I – Arrest Totals by Age in Three Crime Types in Worcester, MA, 2009-2012

Figure Three: Graph of the number of arrests, by age of arrestee, of males aged 12-24 in robberies, aggravated assaults, and drug/narcotics violations. Data pertains to Worcester, MA from 2009 to 2012.
### Appendix J – Performance Targets Fiscal Year 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Component</th>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td>Young men from SSYI list who have been contacted by Outreach staff</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Management</td>
<td>Young men from SSYI list who enroll in the Program</td>
<td>30-60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enrolled young men who have a current Individual Service Plan</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Enrolled young men in need of Education services who are offered Education services</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Training and Employment Services</td>
<td>Enrolled young men who are offered transitional employment services</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enrolled young men who move to a higher tier of employment services</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Health Services</td>
<td>Enrolled young men who are offered Behavioral Health services</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enrolled young men who access Behavioral Health services</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix K – Outcomes and Findings for Calendar Year 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Unduplicated youth on SSYI list (“Proven Risk,” and “Impact Players”)</th>
<th>Unduplicated number of youth on SSYI list contacted this year (by Outreach staff)</th>
<th>Unduplicated SSYI youth enrolled in an SSYI program (Receiving Case Management)</th>
<th>Unduplicated number of SSYI youth enrolled in an education program this year</th>
<th>Unduplicated number of SSYI youth who were employed this year (Subsidized &amp; Unsubsidized)</th>
<th>Unduplicated number of SSYI youth that have received trauma counseling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brockton</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-- **</td>
<td>-- **</td>
<td>-- **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall River</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holyoke</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowell</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-- **</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Bedford</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-- **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsfield</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,531</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>336 **</td>
<td>473 **</td>
<td>244 **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Progress     | 61% of list                                                           | 47% of list                                                                       | 47% of enrolled                                                                 | 66% of enrolled                                                               | 34% of enrolled                                                               |

In addition to the outcomes identified above, 14 SSYI clients graduated from school (traditional or alternative) and 29 SSYI clients were awarded a Massachusetts High School Equivalency Credential (HiSet diploma) in 2016.
Appendix L – Budget: Office of the Secretary of Health and Human Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Safe and Successful Youth Initiative</th>
<th>Percentage Change</th>
<th>Percent of Total Budget</th>
<th>Executive Office of Health &amp; Human Services</th>
<th>Percentage Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY2012</td>
<td>$10,000,000.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
<td>$8,941,084,925.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2013</td>
<td>$4,000,000.00</td>
<td>-60.00%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>$8,760,749,918.00</td>
<td>-2.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2014</td>
<td>$4,000,000.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td>$9,698,334,312.00</td>
<td>10.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2015</td>
<td>$4,600,000.00</td>
<td>15.00%</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td>$10,823,862,960.00</td>
<td>11.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2016</td>
<td>$6,030,000.00</td>
<td>31.09%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>$11,780,132,801.00</td>
<td>8.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2017</td>
<td>$6,560,000.00</td>
<td>8.79%</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
<td>$11,790,531,418.00</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2018</td>
<td>$6,500,000.00</td>
<td>-0.91%</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
<td>$18,815,670,051.00</td>
<td>59.58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Appendix M – City of New Bedford Police Department Crime Stats 2015-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IBR Description</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>1 Year % Change 2015 to 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murder and Non-negligent Manslaughter</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forcible Rape</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>-24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary / Breaking and Entering</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>-19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny</td>
<td>2262</td>
<td>2179</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle Theft</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shots Fired (Victim)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shots Fired (No Victim)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crime</td>
<td>1094</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>-20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Crime</td>
<td>3394</td>
<td>3161</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shots Fired (All)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Crimes Reported to the New Bedford Police Department based on NIBRS data*