NORMATIVE EXPECTATIONS OF THE INTEGRATED JDC/RF* DRUG COURT LOGIC MODEL

PROBLEM

#/% Drug-involved youth in the juvenile justice (JJ) system for law violations

Youth with substance use disorders and criminal behavior

GOALS

Enhance capacity of drug court to increase youth and family functioning

Improve systems to treat and support youth with substance use disorders and criminal behavior

Build community partnerships to ensure a robust referral network and program sustainability

Increase the number of youth who are both drug-free and crime-free

Promote a healthy transition to adulthood

SUB-PROBLEMS

Mental health conditions

Trauma exposure

Low self-esteem

Poor life skills

Educational challenges

Family challenges

Environmental risk

Financial challenges

OBJECTIVES

Work across systems to provide coordinated care and reduce the #/% of drug-involved youth in the JJ system

Implement evidence-based adolescent substance abuse treatment modality or modalities

Utilize community resources for successful youth transition

Increase youth and family efficacy in making healthy lifestyle choices

Cultivate continuous program and individual accountability

KEY ACTIVITIES

Community engagement and collaborative partnerships

Judicial leadership aligned with JDC and RF concepts

Collaborative leadership and structured teamwork

Defined eligibility criteria

Balance confidentiality procedures and collaboration

Comprehensive screening and ongoing assessment

Strength-based care coordination

Individualized evidence-based treatment services

Services appropriate to youths' gender, culture, and development

Engage family in all program components

Regular, random drug testing

Strength-based incentives and sanctions

Program monitoring and evaluation

Educational linkages

Successful initiation, engagement and completion of treatment

Implement community transition plan

OUTPUT MEASURES

#/% Community partnerships formed and active

#/% JDC staff trained in JDC/RF processes and procedures

#/% Staff certified in conducting full biopsychosocial clinical assessments

% Participation of judge in RF judicial activities

Data are/are not shared between involved partners

#/% Screenings, by screening tool

#/% Assessments, by assessment tool

Staffing meeting composition

#/% Youth with individualized treatment service plans

Average length of time from referral to initiation/engagement

#/% Treatment plans with family involvement

Urinalysis screenings and % negative

Youth referred to and enrolled in JDC/RF

#/% Youth initiating and engaging in treatment

#/% Youth in detention and days in detention

#/% Youth referred to and involved in community programs

Pro-social activities provided to youth, parents, caregivers, and families

OUTCOME MEASURES

Short-Term

#/% Youth successfully completing treatment

#/% Youth graduating from JDC/RF

#/% Youth remaining crime- and arrest-free during and at completion of the program

#/% Youth retained in JDC/RF for the minimum amount of time designated by the program

#/% Youth exhibiting a reduction in drug use during and at completion of the program

#/% Youth in educational programs during and at completion of the program

#/% Youth engaged in a drug-free pro-social activity during and at completion of the program

#/% Youth employed during and at completion of the program

Long-Term[i]

#/% Youth who remaining drug-free

#/% Youth remaining crime- and arrest-free

#/% Youth without probation violations

#/% Drug-involved youth in the JJ system

#/% Youth graduating from high-school/receiving GEDs

#/% Youth in stable living conditions

#/% Youth engaged in a drug-free pro-social activity

#/% Youth employed

[i]Six months after program completion

***JDC/RF is an integration of two models used in juvenile drug court practice, Juvenile Drug Courts: Strategies in Practice and Reclaiming Futures**

Disclaimer: The development of this document is funded by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) through an interagency agreement with the Library of Congress – contract number LCFRD11C0007. The views expressed here are the authors and do not necessarily represent the official policies of OJJDP or the Library of Congress; nor does mention of trade names, commercial practices, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.

Acknowledgements: SIROW and Carnevale Associates, LLC wish to acknowledge the contributions of the evaluation sites and the evaluation partner, Chestnut Health Systems, to the JDC/RF National Cross-Site Evaluation. In addition, we appreciate the 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: Carnevale Associates, LLC and University of Arizona - Southwest Institute for Research on Women (2014). National Cross-Site Evaluation of Juvenile Drug Courts and Reclaiming Futures. Normative Expectations of the Integrated JDC/RF Drug Court Logic Model- January 2014. The University of Arizona: Tucson, Arizona.

About The Integrated JDC/RF Drug Court Logic Model

Overview

The Normative Expectations of the Integrated JDC/RF Drug Court Logic Model (hereafter, the Logic Model) provides a framework for integrating two models used in juvenile drug court practice: Juvenile Drug Courts: Strategies in Practice (JDC) and Reclaiming Futures (RF). The Logic Model serves multiple purposes, although it was initially created as a tool for the JDC/RF National-Cross Site Evaluation Team (hereafter, the evaluation team) to assess implementation of the integrated models. This model does not intend to depict *all* juvenile drug court operational models, only those implementing the integrated JDC/RF model. It also is not a "how to" manual that describes the methods a juvenile drug court site should use for implementation. The Logic Model is simply a global view of JDC/RF based on the evaluation team's interpretation of successful components and traditional performance measures.

The JDC/RF Integrated Logic Model

The JDC and RF models both focus on juveniles and contain evidence-based components necessary for successful outcomes. However, the models differ in that JDC details a framework to plan, implement, and operate a juvenile drug court, while RF addresses elements in a systems approach that focuses on the continuum of care from screening to transition. The evaluation team developed the Logic Model as a starting point to measure the implementation of the JDC's components and the RF systems approach as well as the fidelity to the integration of those models. The resulting Logic Model is a unified method of operations that links the problem of youth with substance abuse disorders and criminal behavior, associated sub-problems, goals, objectives, program activities, outputs, and outcomes.

The Logic Model also serves as a benchmark against which the evaluation team can measure each site's implementation and can be used by the sites to measure their own progress. The suggested output and outcome measures, both qualitative and quantitative, align performance with the goals, objectives, and key activities. Therefore, if a site has undesirable outputs or outcomes, those results can be linked back to key activities and objectives, and adjustments can be made accordingly for future program activities.

Methodology

The Logic Model was developed via a collaborative process initiated by The University of Arizona's Southwest Institute for Research on Women and Carnevale Associates, LLC. Chestnut Health Systems, the Reclaiming Futures National Program Office, the National Council for Juvenile and Family Court Judges were involved, and JDC/RF sites were consulted for input as to whether the problem, sub-problem, goals, and objectives were aligned with their current activities. Feedback was incorporated into the final version of the Logic Model.

To create the Logic Model, the evaluation team incorporated JDC/RF concepts into the OJJDP logic model template. Starting with overall core concepts and narrowing down to specific activities, JDC/RF was considered in terms of goals, objectives, activities, outputs, and outcomes that represent the evaluation team's view of how programs could implement JDC/RF. All components are a synthesis of the two models. For instance, the 16 "key activities" of the Logic Model are not the same as the 16 "Strategies in Practice" but are the original 16 Strategies in Practice melded with RF philosophy and terminology. They are a list of what should occur throughout the course of the program if the integrated JDC/RF model is implemented with fidelity.

Many components, such as the problem, sub-problem, goals, and objectives, originate from OJJDP's three JDC/RF cohorts' Request for Proposal (RFP). Other components, such as the output and outcome measures, are drug court evaluation standards or were developed by the evaluation team to measure the extent and quality of site involvement in the key activities. It is important to note that the lists in each of the components are not hierarchical. All items in each of the Logic Model components carry equal weight.

Purposes

The Logic Model serves four main purposes. First, it's a research tool for the National Cross-Site Evaluation. The evaluation team uses scaled measures associated with each of the 16 key activities to determine site implementation fidelity. This implementation fidelity analysis links to outcomes to measure the degree to which the key activities influence client success. Second, it can be used as a training tool for the JDC/RF initiatives. Individuals who work closely with JDC/RF can use the Logic Model to explain the integration when providing technical assistance to sites or speaking to stakeholders in public forums. Third, the Logic Model can be used by site program staff as a tool to guide strategic planning and program implementation at JDC/RF sites. It outlines how the two models can be integrated, the underlying philosophy, and the metrics used to measure success. Finally, the Logic Model can play an important role in shaping policy and practice for participating sites. It will guide the evaluation team to discover what works and what does not work in various contexts. These findings are communicated with the sites, creating a feedback loop for improvement. The Logic Model is also not static and should be considered a living document that can be adapted to accommodate changes as they arise.