

EVALUATING IMPACT, MONITORING PERFORMANCE, AND ANALYZING COSTS IN A NEW GENERATION OF JUVENILE DRUG COURTS:

THE NATIONAL CROSS-SITE EVALUATION OF JUVENILE DRUG COURTS AND RECLAIMING FUTURES

Josephine D. Korchmaros, PhD, Sally J. Stevens, PhD, & Alison R. Greene, MA
University of Arizona-Southwest Institute for Research on Women (SIROW)
University of Arizona

American Society of Criminology ♦ November 21, 2014

Public Health and Safety Problem

- Over 1.7 million (7%) of U.S. youth age 12-17 have a substance use problem (SAMHSA, 2013)
- The effects of substance use during childhood and adolescence can have numerous negative effects

Juvenile Drug Courts (JDCs)

- As of June 3, 2013, there were 447 JDCs in operation in the United States (National Institute of Justice).
- The Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP, 2010) supports the expansion of drug courts, including JDCs, to achieve ONDCP's objective of breaking the cycle between drugs and crime.
- SAMHSA has identified drug courts as a key tool in reducing problems related to trauma and has established "Trauma and Justice" as one of its eight strategic initiatives.

Emerging Evidence Supporting JDCs


- Outcomes of JDC participants are greatly enhanced if the court incorporates an evidence-based substance abuse intervention component (Henggeler, 2007).
- Data suggest that JDCs that implement the 16 JDC strategies can result in favorable outcomes (Carey, Allen et al., 2013).
- Preliminary evidence suggests that integrating the JDC elements and RF are effective (Butts, Roman et al., 2007).

National Cross-site Evaluation of JDCs and RF

Evaluation of the effectiveness and efficacy of JDCs by integrating the JDC: Strategies in Practice with the RF Model.

Cross-site Evaluation Team



- University of Arizona's Southwest Institute for Research on Women (SIROW)
 - Carnevale Associates, LLC
 - Chestnut Health Systems
- 

Cross-site Evaluation Overview

- Multi-Site, four-year evaluation of the Juvenile Drug Court and Reclaiming Futures Initiative
- Charged with evaluating the processes, impact, and cost-effectiveness of integrating the Juvenile Drug Court: Strategies in Practice and the Reclaiming Futures Models

Overview of Methodology

- Client-level data
 - Global Appraisal of Individual Needs (GAIN; Dennis, Titus, et al., 2008; www.gaincc.org)
 - Client characteristics and behaviors
 - Client outcomes
- JDC/RF Program/Site-level data
 - Online surveys, site visits, observation of Drug Court/Change Team meetings, in-depth individual interviews with JDC/RF program staff
 - Program characteristics

Trainings Utilized

Describe the trainings JDC personnel received generally and specifically for the purpose of implementing the JDC Strategies and RF Model.

Methodology



- Informal training
 - Information from JDC/RF program staff

Informal Trainings

Percent of Staff who Obtained Self-Directed Informal Training Regarding the RF Model			
Evaluation Site	October (Total N = 80)	November (Total N = 62)	December (Total N = 57)
1	100%	80%	40%
2	82%	78%	63%
3	67%	63%	71%
4	63%	57%	46%
5	74%	83%	65%
All sites	73%	71%	60%

Percent of Staff who Obtained Self-Directed Informal Training Regarding the JDC: Strategies in Practice			
Evaluation Site	October (Total N = 79)	November (Total N = 60)	December (Total N = 57)
1	88%	100%	20%
2	82%	67%	75%
3	44%	56%	71%
4	50%	54%	46%
5	72%	56%	47%
All sites	62%	60%	54%

- ❑ Most JDC/RF staff sought out RF and JDC Strategies training.
- ❑ They sought out training years into the implementation of RF and the JDC Strategies.



Implementation of RF Model in JDCs

Describe how the JDC/RF sites implemented RF.

Methodology

- Compare the JDC/RF sites' original plan for implementing RF to the actual implementation plan
- Examine modifications and adaptations over time

Modifications & Adaptations

- All of the JDC/RF sites modified and/or adapted their implementation plan over time in response to client need and/or site-specific challenges to implementation.



Evaluation of Services Provided by JDC/RF Programs

Describe the services provided by the JDC/RF sites and their effectiveness

Methodology

- JDC/RF site representatives provide data regarding
 - client recruitment
 - services provided
- JDC/RF sites provide data concerning client-level outcomes (GAIN data)

Program Referral, Eligibility, Enrollment

Program Referral, Eligibility, and Enrollment from October 2012 to January 2013					
Evaluation Site	Number of Youth Referred to Program	Percent Referred from the Juvenile Justice System	Percent Referred from Parents	Percent Who Met Juvenile Drug Court Criteria	Percent of Those Who Met the Criteria Who were Enrolled in the Program
1	7	100%	0%	71%	100%
2	8	100%	0%	100%	100%
3	21	62%	38%	81%	100%
4	43	100%	0%	81%	83%
All Sites	79	90%	10%	82%	91%

- The sites' referral systems are identifying youth in need of program services.
- The sites' enrollment procedures are effective.

Services Provided

Amount of Services Provided Across Evaluation Site from October 2012 to January 2013

Evaluation Site	Number of Different Types of Treatment and Services Provided	Number of Times Treatment Sessions and Services were Provided
1	17	1,855
2	13	4,193
3	14	3,369
4	8	2,053
Total	22	11,470

- All of the evaluation sites provided numerous types of treatment and services and provided them frequently.
- There was some variation across site.



Evaluation of Services Provided by JDC/RF Programs

Describe the services provided by the JDC/RF sites and their effectiveness

Overall Effectiveness and Critical Components of JDC/RF Programs

Do JDC/RF clients receive the substance abuse treatment that they need?

- *Yes!* On average overall, JDC/RF program clients are more likely to receive treatment as needed than to not receive treatment as needed, $OR = 5.87$, $logit = 1.77$, $t(4) = 3.32$, $p = .029$.
- The probability of a JDC/RF program client receiving treatment as needed is .85.

Does this probability vary by JDC/RF program?

- *Yes!* 55.6% of JDC/RF Program 1 clients, 94.6% of JDC/RF Program 2 clients, 96.0% of JDC/RF Program 3 clients, 83.1% of JDC/RF Program 4 clients, and 78.9% of JDC/RF Program 5 client received treatment as needed.

Overall Effectiveness and Critical Components of JDC/RF Programs

Do JDC/RF program characteristics affect client receipt of substance abuse treatment as needed?

Program Characteristics	Logit	OR	t(df)	p
Administration Indices				
Access to Services Index	-0.45	0.63	-1.88	.157
Data Sharing Index	-0.06	0.94	-0.09	.937
Systems Integration Index	-1.95	0.14	-6.35	.008
Resource Management Index	-0.43	0.65	-1.44	.246
Collaboration Indices				
Client Information Index	0.08	1.08	0.09	.934
Partner Involvement Index	-0.59	0.56	-0.91	.431
Agency Collaboration Index	0.58	1.78	0.56	.616
Quality Indices				
AOD ^b Assessment Index	-0.41	0.67	-0.73	.520
Treatment Effectiveness Index	-1.25	0.29	-1.94	.148
Targeted Treatment Index	1.86	2.82	5.70	.011
Cultural Integration Index	-0.62	0.54	-1.51	.229
Family Involvement Index	0.38	1.46	0.81	.476
Pro-social Activities Index	-0.54	0.58	-1.55	.218

Cost-effectiveness Study of Implementation of RF Model in JDCs

Describe the costs and benefits of integrating RF and JDC and an examination of the overall cost effectiveness of integrating JDC and RF.

System-level Evaluation of Implementation of RF Model in JDCs

Examine the system-level processes related to the implementation of RF and the impact that this implementation has had on individuals working within the system and on characteristics of the system.

Methodology

- Online survey of JDC/RF program expert informants once a year assessing program/system-level effects in the areas of administration, collaboration, and quality (Butts & Roman, 2007)

JDC/RF Program Characteristics

Program Characteristics	All (N =90)	1 (N=14)	2 (N=14)	3 (N=35)	4 (N=15)	5 (N=12)	F(4,85)	p
Administration Indices								
Access to Services Index	-1.28	-0.18	0.27	-2.96	-1.08	0.31	3.02	.022
Data Sharing Index	0.52	0.00	0.93	-0.11	1.47	1.33	0.50	.737
Systems Integration Index	1.56	2.23	1.25	0.96	2.08	2.19	0.53	.715
Resource Management Index	1.69	1.50	1.50	0.71	2.80	3.58	1.88	.122
Collaboration Indices								
Client Information Index	2.95	3.00	4.14	2.33	2.93	3.33	0.94	.444
Partner Involvement Index	2.83	2.54	2.32	2.59	3.58	3.54	0.59	.668
Agency Collaboration Index	3.60	3.42	4.34	3.31	3.38	4.05	0.47	.758
Quality Indices								
AOD Assessment Index	3.06	3.04	3.81	2.12	4.00	3.75	1.70	.157
Treatment Effectiveness Index	1.79	2.20	2.38	1.12	2.00	2.29	0.76	.558
Targeted Treatment Index	-0.08	-1.29	1.01	-0.04	-0.38	0.31	1.11	.358
Cultural Integration Index	1.89	2.98	1.90	1.10	3.33	1.11	1.50	.208
Family Involvement Index	2.00	0.63	2.59	1.57	2.92	3.02	0.80	.529
Pro-social Activities Index	0.25	1.07	0.18	-0.14	-0.83	1.88	0.64	.634

Conclusion

- Although the JDC/RF programs are responsive to the particular needs of their clients and challenges particular to their sites, replication of JDC/RF programs seems possible.
- JDC/RF programs are effective.
- Critical components of JDC/RF programs include (a) the adequacy of the community youth-serving agencies' access to targeted treatment and (b) the extent to which a system in which a JDC/RF program is implemented needs systems integration.

Questions?



Questions: Contact Josephine Korchmaros, 520-295-9339 x210, jkorch@email.arizona.edu

Disclaimer: The development of this presentation is funded by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) through an interagency agreement with the Library of Congress-contract number LCFRD11C0007 and is supported by Grant Number 2013-DC-BX-0081 awarded by OJJDP, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. The opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed here are the authors and do not necessarily represent the official policies of the Department of Justice or the Library of Congress; nor does mention of trade names, commercial practices, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.

Acknowledgements: SIROW wishes to acknowledge the contributions of the evaluation sites and the evaluation partners, Chestnut Health Systems (CHS) and Carnevale Associates, LLC (CALLC) to this National Cross-Site Evaluation. In addition, SIROW is appreciative of support from the Library of Congress - Federal Research Division, OJJDP, the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, and the Reclaiming Futures National Program Office.

Suggested Citation: Korchmaros, J. D., Stevens, S. J. & Greene, A. R. (November, 2014). The National Cross-site Evaluation of Juvenile Drug Courts and Reclaiming Futures. Paper presented at the *American Society of Criminology 70th Annual Meeting*, San Francisco, CA.