

*The University of Arizona*

*Southwest Institute for Research on Women*

---

# National Cross-Site Evaluation

Juvenile Drug Courts  
and Reclaiming Futures

*Formal Training Report  
Eight Site Report  
March 2016*



This report summarizes formal training activities of the eight evaluation sites that participated in the National Cross-Site Evaluation of Juvenile Drug Courts and Reclaiming Futures. Formal training data reported by The National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges (NCJFCJ) and The Reclaiming Futures National Program Office (RF NPO), as well as formal training data reported by representatives at the eight evaluations sites, was analyzed by the evaluation team and is detailed below.

### **Summary of Formal Training Reported by NCJFCJ and RF NPO**

These data reflect formal training obtained by staff of Juvenile Drug Court: Strategies in Practice and Reclaiming Futures (JDC/RF) programs implemented in eight Juvenile Drug Courts in the United States (i.e., the evaluation Sites) as reported by representatives of NCJFCJ and RF NPO. These data reflect formal trainings sourced from NCJFCJ and the RF NPO. Formal training was defined as training that is scheduled by The JDC or another organization and might be required and/or paid for by the JDC or another organization. These are structured professional development activities. Types of formal trainings include, for example, in-services, workshops, online courses, webinars, and conferences.

Collection of these data coincided with years 1-4 of the Evaluation Sites' OJJDP- and SAMHSA-funded grant periods. The data show specifics on formal trainings received during six month increments over time. Henceforth, the 6 month increments are designated by project year (Y) and quarter (Q) with Q1\_Q2 referring to the first half of the project year and Q3\_Q4 referring to the second half of the project year. Three sites did not report data for the last two quarters of Year four.

The Evaluation Sites obtained numerous formal trainings provided by RF NPO and NCJFCJ during the four years of their OJJDP and SAMHSA-funded grant periods (Table 1). However, the number of trainings received varied over time and by Evaluation Site. On average, the Evaluation Sites obtained between 7.5 and 14.5 of formal trainings from RF NPO and NCJFCJ per 6 month period. Although RF NPO and NCJFCJ provided many trainings to the Evaluation Sites throughout the entire 4 year grant-funded project period, the number of trainings provided varied over time with more trainings being provided, on average, during the second half of each year ( $M = 10.3, 14.5, 13.6$  and  $13.2$ ) as compared to the first half of each year ( $M = 7.8, 9.5, 8.1$  and  $7.5$ ). The number of formal trainings obtained from RF NPO and NCJFCJ also varied somewhat by Evaluation Site from as low as 8.4 to as high as 12.9, on average per 6 month period. In addition, as illustrated in Table 1, the pattern of change over time in the number of trainings obtained from RF NPO and NCJFCJ varied by Evaluation Site.

Table 1:

Number of RF NPO and NCJFCJ Formal Trainings Provided Over Time and by Evaluation Site									
6 Month Period									
Evaluation Site	Y1 Q1_Q2	Y1 Q3_Q4	Y2 Q1_Q2	Y2 Q3_Q4	Y3 Q1_Q2	Y3 Q3_Q4	Y4 Q1_Q2	Y4 Q3_Q4	Mean
Site 1	8	5	4	18	13	11	5	3	<b>8.4</b>
Site 2	5	16	9	9	4	7	14	19	<b>10.4</b>
Site 3	8	13	15	13	3	12	11	18	<b>11.6</b>
Site 4	9	11	7	12	3	7	12	18	<b>9.9</b>
Site 5	9	6	3	14	14	10	4	8	<b>8.5</b>
Site 6	7	13	13	20	8	10	4	-	<b>10.7</b>
Site 7	6	8	10	12	9	30	6	-	<b>11.6</b>
Site 8	10	10	15	18	11	22	4	-	<b>12.9</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>7.8</b>	<b>10.3</b>	<b>9.5</b>	<b>14.5</b>	<b>8.1</b>	<b>13.6</b>	<b>7.5</b>	<b>13.2</b>	

These findings indicate that the Evaluation Sites were well-supported by RF NPO and NCJFCJ with frequent and numerous trainings throughout the duration of the grant-funded project period. These findings also suggest some specificity in frequency and number of trainings as not all Evaluation Sites received the same number of trainings from RF NPO and NCJFCJ.

As shown in Table 2, RF NPO and NCJFCJ reached a substantial number of trainees<sup>1</sup> during the grant-funded project period with their trainings. Furthermore, the number of trainees varied across time and by Evaluation Site. On average, the RF NPO and NCJFCJ trainings provided at each Evaluation Site reached between 15.1 and 51.2 trainees per 6 month period. The number of trainees varied over time with more trainees being reached by RF NPO and NCJFCJ trainings, on average, during both halves of Year 2 ( $M = 38.3$  and  $33.5$ ) and the second half of Years 1 and 3 ( $M = 28.8$  and  $40.9$ ) than during the other 6 month periods where all sites reported training data. The number of trainees also varied overall by Evaluation Site, from as low as 17.5 to as high as 64.1, on average per 6 month period. In addition, as illustrated in Table 2, the pattern of change over time in the number of trainees varied by Evaluation Site.

---

<sup>1</sup> The counts and means reflect the total number of JDC/RF staff who attended the trainings across all of the trainings provided. These counts and averages are *not* adjusted based on whether individual JDC/RF staff received multiple trainings. A staff member who attended two of the trainings would be counted twice, once for each training attended. Therefore, the counts and means reflect the total number of trainees across all of the trainings provided, *not* the total number of JDC/RF staff trained.

Table 2:

Number of Trainees Reached by RF NPO and NCJFCJ Trainings Over Time and by Evaluation Site									
6 Month Period									
Evaluation Site	Y1 Q1_Q2	Y1 Q3_Q4	Y2 Q1_Q2	Y2 Q3_Q4	Y3 Q1_Q2	Y3 Q3_Q4	Y4 Q1_Q2	Y4 Q3_Q4	Mean
Site 1	23	13	9	24	25	24	14	8	<b>17.5</b>
Site 2	27	34	15	14	4	45	39	72	<b>31.3</b>
Site 3	35	19	184	52	8	78	29	108	<b>64.1</b>
Site 4	32	22	11	42	7	35	12	41	<b>25.3</b>
Site 5	24	13	6	28	53	27	7	27	<b>23.1</b>
Site 6	13	52	37	38	39	4	0	-	<b>26.1</b>
Site 7	14	36	10	29	23	87	20	-	<b>31.3</b>
Site 8	10	41	34	41	44	27	0	-	<b>28.1</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>22.3</b>	<b>28.8</b>	<b>38.3</b>	<b>33.5</b>	<b>25.4</b>	<b>40.9</b>	<b>15.1</b>	<b>51.2</b>	

Similar to the findings regarding number of RF NPO and NCJFCJ trainings provided, these findings indicate that the Evaluation Sites were well-supported by RF NPO and NCJFCJ with a substantial number of trainees reached by their trainings throughout the duration of the grant-funded project period. These findings also suggest some specificity in number of trainees reached as the number of trainees varied across Evaluation Site.

RF NPO and NCJFCJ provided trainings to all eight Evaluation Sites on a wide range of topics. The main topical categories included: Health, Justice, Organization/Sustainability, Reclaiming Futures, and Treatment/Service Provision. Health trainings included trainings related to, for example, physical health and disease, mental health issues, substance abuse, and trauma. Trainings denoted as Organization/Sustainability included trainings related to, for example, office and computer skills, data management, and funding. Reclaiming Futures trainings focused on issues and concepts related specifically to the Reclaiming Futures model. Treatment/Service Provision included trainings related to, for example, cultural competency, case management, and specific treatment programs. Some of the trainings covered a breadth of content and, thus, were coded as addressing multiple topics.

As shown in Table 3, RF NPO and NCJFCJ focused on some topics more than others in the formal trainings that they provided to the Evaluation Sites. On average per 6 month period, the trainings provided by RF NPO and NCJFCJ focused the most on treatment and service provision ( $M = 47.1$ ) and organization and sustainability ( $M = 29.3$ ). On average per 6 month period, these trainings focused the least on health ( $M = 3.0$ ) and justice ( $M = 8.8$ ). This differential focus on topic was similar for all Evaluation Sites. The number of trainings of each type provided by RF NPO and NCJFCJ varied over time overall and for each Evaluation Site with no notable pattern.

Table 3:

<b>Types of Formal Training Provided by RF NPO and NCJFCJ Over Time</b>									
<b>6 Month Period</b>									
<b>Type of Training</b>	Y1 Q1_Q2	Y1 Q3_Q4	Y2 Q1_Q2	Y2 Q3_Q4	Y3 Q1_Q2	Y3 Q3_Q4	Y4 Q1_Q2	Y4 Q3_Q4	<b>Mean</b>
Health	0	1	5	7	7	0	3	1	<b>3.0</b>
Justice	9	16	9	13	7	2	5	9	<b>8.8</b>
Organization/ Sustainability	27	25	20	43	28	28	27	36	<b>29.3</b>
Reclaiming Futures	30	24	9	25	13	12	14	19	<b>18.3</b>
Treatment/ Service Provision	28	78	40	64	45	51	42	29	<b>47.1</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>18.8</b>	<b>28.8</b>	<b>16.6</b>	<b>30.4</b>	<b>20.0</b>	<b>18.6</b>	<b>18.2</b>	<b>18.8</b>	

These findings also indicate that, overall, the Evaluation Sites were well-supported by RF NPO and NCJFCJ throughout the duration of the grant-funded project period. RF NPO and NCJFCJ provided numerous trainings covering a board range of topics relevant to JDC and serving youth throughout the duration of the grant-funded project period.

#### **Summary of Formal Training Reported by Evaluation Site Representatives**

These data reflect formal training obtained by staff of Juvenile Drug Court: Strategies in Practice and Reclaiming Futures (JDC/RF) programs implemented in eight Juvenile Drug Courts in the United States (i.e., the evaluation sites) as reported by evaluation site representatives during the last three years of their grant funded periods. Formal training was defined as training that is scheduled by The JDC or another organization and might be required and/or paid for by the JDC or another organization. These are structured professional development activities. Types of formal trainings include, for example, in-services, workshops, online courses, webinars, and conferences. These data reflect formal training obtained from sources other than NCJFCJ and the RF NPO.

Collection of these data coincided with the second (Y2) and third (Y3) years of the 4-year OJJDP and SAMHSA grant-funded period for three of the eight Evaluation Sites, the third (Y3) and fourth (Y4) years for three of the eight Evaluation Sites, and the fourth (Y4) year only for two Evaluation Sites. The data show specifics on formal trainings received during six month increments over time. Henceforth, the six month increments are designated by project year (Y) and quarter (Q) with Q1\_Q2 referring to the first half of the project year and Q3\_Q4 referring to the second half of the project year.

The Evaluation Sites obtained numerous formal trainings provided by sources other than RF NPO and NCJFCJ (Table 4). The number of trainings received varied over time and by Evaluation Site. On average overall, the Evaluation Sites obtained between 9.0 and 30.0 formal training per six month period from agencies other than RF NPO and NCJFCJ. The overall average number of these formal trainings obtained by each Evaluation Site per six month period varied from as low 2.5 to as high as 104.8. In addition, as illustrated in Table 4, the pattern of change over time in the number of formal trainings obtained varied by Evaluation Site. The number of these formal trainings obtained by each Evaluation Site varied over time for all Evaluation Sites except for Site 1. Furthermore, Site 2 and Site 7 experienced the most change over time with Site 2 displaying a substantial

reduction in number of formal trainings obtained in the fourth year of their grant-funded period (Number of trainings = 74 and 91) as compared to the third year (Number of trainings = 118 and 136) and Site 7 displaying a substantial reduction in number of formal trainings obtained in the third year of their grant-funded period (Number of trainings = 9 and 4) as compared to the second year (Number of trainings = 19 and 27).

Table 4:

Number of Formal Trainings Attended Over Time and by Evaluation Site							
6 Month Period							
Evaluation Site	Y2 Q1_Q2	Y2 Q3_Q4	Y3 Q1_Q2	Y3 Q3_Q4	Y4 Q1_Q2	Y4 Q3_Q4	Mean
Site 1					7	7	<b>7.0</b>
Site 2			118	136	74	91	<b>104.8</b>
Site 3			17	28	22	31	<b>24.5</b>
Site 4			4	4	2	8	<b>4.5</b>
Site 5					3	2	<b>2.5</b>
Site 6	4	14	11	5			<b>8.5</b>
Site 7*	19	27	9	4			<b>14.8</b>
Site 8*	4	9	7	3			<b>5.8</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>16.7</b>	<b>27.7</b>	<b>30.0</b>	<b>21.6</b>	<b>27.8</b>	<b>21.6</b>

\*Sites submitted training data on a monthly basis. Site 7 was unable to submit data for one month of Y2\_Q1\_Q2 and for 2 months of Y3\_Q3\_Q4. Site 8 was also unable to submit training data for one month of Y3\_Q1\_Q2.

These findings indicate that the Evaluation Sites valued staff training with all sites providing training opportunities every six month period that was reported. These findings also indicate variation by site in training opportunities available to staff as not all sites experienced the same number of formal trainings.

As shown in Table 5, the formal trainings obtained by the Evaluation Sites that were provided by agencies other than RF NPO and NCJFCJ reached a substantial number of trainees<sup>2</sup>, although the number of trainees varied across time and by Evaluation Site. On average, the trainings received by the Evaluation Sites reached between 22.3 and 121.2 trainees per six month period. The number of trainees also varied widely by Evaluation Site, with the average number of trainees at each Evaluation Site varying from as low as 5.0 to as high as 235.0. Furthermore, the number of trainees at each Evaluation Site varied over time for all Sites. Site 3 experienced the largest increase in trainees in the fourth year of their grant-funded period (Number of staff trained = 259 and 314) as compared to the third year (Number of staff trained = 121 and 107).

<sup>2</sup> The counts and means reflect the total number of JDC/RF staff who attended the trainings across all of the trainings provided. These counts and averages are *not* adjusted based on whether individual JDC/RF staff received multiple trainings. A staff member who attended two of the trainings would be counted twice, once for each training attended. Therefore, the counts and means reflect the total number of trainees across all of the trainings provided, *not* the total number of JDC/RF staff trained.

Table 5:

Number and Type of Trainees Reached Over Time by Evaluation Site							
6 Month Period							
Type of Staff	Y2 Q1_Q2	Y2 Q3_Q4	Y3 Q1_Q2	Y3 Q3_Q4	Y4 Q1_Q2	Y4 Q3_Q4	Mean
<i>All Staff</i>							
Site 1					21	38	<b>29.5</b>
Site 2			257	322	138	223	<b>235.0</b>
Site 3			121	107	259	314	<b>200.3</b>
Site 4			16	20	10	27	<b>18.3</b>
Site 5					6	4	<b>5.0</b>
Site 6	8	39	34	30			<b>27.8</b>
Site 7*	32	178	118	23			<b>87.8</b>
Site 8*	27	59	33	25			<b>36.0</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>22.3</b>	<b>92.0</b>	<b>96.5</b>	<b>87.8</b>	<b>86.8</b>	<b>121.2</b>	<b>80.0</b>
<i>Staff with Direct Contact with Youth</i>							
Site 1					17	31	<b>24.0</b>
Site 2			207	228	105	180	<b>180.0</b>
Site 3			89	85	203	263	<b>160.0</b>
Site 4			16	17	9	27	<b>17.3</b>
Site 5					4	3	<b>3.5</b>
Site 6	0	26	21	23			<b>17.5</b>
Site 7*	10	111	90	6			<b>54.3</b>
Site 8*	17	50	17	21			<b>26.3</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>62.3</b>	<b>73.3</b>	<b>63.3</b>	<b>67.6</b>	<b>100.8</b>	<b>60.4</b>
<i>Administrative Staff</i>							
Site 1					1	3	<b>2.0</b>
Site 2			30	53	23	30	<b>34.0</b>
Site 3			20	2	25	15	<b>15.5</b>
Site 4			9	9	5	13	<b>9.0</b>
Site 5					0	0	<b>0.0</b>
Site 6	0	3	5	0			<b>2.0</b>
Site 7*	17	23	16	8			<b>16.0</b>
Site 8*	8	14	9	5			<b>9.0</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>8.3</b>	<b>13.3</b>	<b>14.8</b>	<b>12.8</b>	<b>10.8</b>	<b>12.2</b>	<b>10.9</b>
<i>Management</i>							
Site 1					4	5	<b>4.5</b>
Site 2			59	69	50	89	<b>66.8</b>
Site 3			13	20	31	36	<b>25.0</b>
Site 4			7	7	3	10	<b>6.8</b>
Site 5					3	2	<b>2.5</b>
Site 6	3	12	2	7			<b>6.0</b>
Site 7*	6	18	12	9			<b>11.3</b>
Site 8*	10	10	4	2			<b>6.5</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>13.3</b>	<b>16.2</b>	<b>19.0</b>	<b>18.2</b>	<b>28.4</b>	<b>16.2</b>

\*Sites submitted training data on a monthly basis. Site 7 was unable to submit data for one month of Y2\_Q1\_Q2 and for 2 months of Y3\_Q3\_Q4. Site 8 was also unable to submit training data for one month of Y3\_Q1\_Q2.

Similar to the findings regarding number of trainings provided to the Evaluation Sites by agencies other than RF NPO and NCJFCJ, these findings indicate that the Evaluation Sites valued staff training with a substantial number of trainees reached throughout the duration of the grant-funded project period. These findings also suggest some specificity in number of trainees reached as the number of trainees varied across Evaluation Site.

Trainees categorized their staff position type as either management, administrative, and/or as having direct contact with youth, with some trainees reporting more than one staff position type. As shown in Table 5, on average, all Evaluation Sites reported that the majority of trainees were staff with direct contact with youth (*M per 6 month period* = 9.0 – 100.8), with management staff being the second largest group of trainees (*M per 6 month period* = 6.3 – 28.4), and administrative staff the least reported group of trainees (*M per 6 month period* = 8.3 – 14.8). There were a few exceptions to this pattern. Site 4 reported more administrative staff on average being trained per six month period (*M* = 9.0) than management staff (*M* = 6.8), and both Sites 7 and 8 reported more administrative staff on average being trained per six month period (*M* = 16.0 and *M* = 9.0 respectively) than management staff (*M* = 11.3 and *M* = 6.5 respectively).

On average per six month period, the Evaluation Sites had between 9.0 and 100.8 trainees in roles with direct contact with youth. The number of trainees in roles with direct contact with youth varied widely by Evaluation Site with averages per six month period ranging from as low 3.5 to as high as 180.0. The number of trainees in roles with direct contact with youth varied over time for all Evaluation Sites with the exception of Site 5 (Number of trainees = 4 and 3). Evaluation Sites 2 and 3 experienced the largest changes over time with Evaluation Site 2 having fewer trainees in roles with direct contact with youth in Year 4 (Number of trainees = 285) than in Year 3 (Number of trainees = 435), whereas Evaluation Site 3 had many more trainees in roles with direct contact with youth in Year 4 (Number of trainees = 466) than in Year 3 (Number of trainees = 174).

On average per six month period, Evaluation Sites had between 8.3 and 14.8 administrative staff trainees. The number of administrative staff trainees also varied widely by Evaluation Site with averages per six month period ranging from as low as 2.0 to as high as 34.0. The number of administrative staff trainees varied over time for most Evaluation Sites, with the exception of Evaluation Site 5.

On average per 6 month period, Evaluation Sites had between 6.3 and 28.4 management trainees. The number of management trainees also varied widely by Evaluation Site with averages per 6 month period ranging from as low as 2.5 to as high as 66.8. The number of management trainees varied over time for all Evaluation Sites. Evaluation Sites 2 and 3 experienced the largest changes over time with both Sites having more management trainees in Year 4 (Site 2 Number of trainees = 139; Site 3 Number of trainees = 67) than in Year 3 (Site 2 Number of trainees = 128; Site 3 Number of trainees = 33).

These findings indicate that the Evaluation Sites valued training for staff in a variety of roles with most sites providing training opportunities to staff with direct contact with youth, administrative staff and management during every six month period. These findings also indicate variation by site in training opportunities available to staff in different roles.

Trainees at all eight Evaluation Sites received formal training on a wide range of topics. As with the trainings provided by RF NPO and NCJFCJ, the main topical categories included: Health, Justice, Organization/Sustainability, and Treatment/Service Provision. Health trainings included trainings related to, for

example, physical health and disease, mental health issues, substance abuse, and trauma. Trainings denoted as Organization/Sustainability included trainings related to office and computer skills, data management, and funding. Treatment/Service Provision included trainings related to cultural competency, case management, and specific treatment programs. Some of the trainings covered a breadth of content and, thus, were coded as addressing multiple topics.

As shown in Table 6, on average per 6 month period, the formal trainings provided at the Evaluation Sites focused on all four topics. However, overall, the trainings focused more on treatment and service provision ( $M = 50.0$ ) than on organization and sustainability ( $M = 38.8$ ), justice ( $M = 35.0$ ) and health ( $M = 32.8$ ).

Table 6:

<b>Number and Type of Formal Trainings Over Time and by Evaluation Site</b>							
<b>6 Month Period</b>							
<b>Type of Training</b>	Y2 Q1_Q2	Y2 Q3_Q4	Y3 Q1_Q2	Y3 Q3_Q4	Y4 Q1_Q2	Y4 Q3_Q4	<b>Mean</b>
Health	4	11	48	58	39	37	<b>32.8</b>
Justice	5	10	45	59	42	49	<b>35.0</b>
Organization/Sustainability	15	13	60	61	33	51	<b>38.8</b>
Treatment/Service Provision	8	18	64	86	58	66	<b>50.0</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>13.0</b>	<b>54.3</b>	<b>66.0</b>	<b>43.0</b>	<b>50.8</b>	<b>39.2</b>

This differential focus on topic was not consistent across all Evaluation Sites. As shown in Table 7, the trainings at Evaluation Sites 1, 2, 3, 5 and 8 focused more on treatment and service provision as compared to the other training topics on average ( $M=4.5$ ,  $M=45.0$ ,  $M=16.3$ ,  $M=2.0$ , and  $M=2.0$  respectively), whereas Site 4 focused most on justice ( $M=2.3$ ), Site 6, focused most on health ( $M=2.5$ ) and Site 7 focused most on organization/sustainability trainings ( $M=7.0$ ) on average. In general, though, most sites offered some type of training in each of the four topic areas every six months.

Table 7:

<b>Types of Formal Training Over Time</b>							
<b>6 Month Period</b>							
<b>Type of Training</b>	<b>Y2 Q1_Q2</b>	<b>Y2 Q3_Q4</b>	<b>Y3 Q1_Q2</b>	<b>Y3 Q3_Q4</b>	<b>Y4 Q1_Q2</b>	<b>Y4 Q3_Q4</b>	<b>Mean</b>
<i>Health</i>							
Site 1					4	3	<b>3.5</b>
Site 2			39	45	25	18	<b>31.8</b>
Site 3			5	10	8	12	<b>8.8</b>
Site 4			0	0	0	3	<b>0.8</b>
Site 5					2	1	<b>1.5</b>
Site 6	1	5	1	3			<b>2.5</b>
Site 7*	2	6	1	0			<b>2.3</b>
Site 8*	1	0	2	0			<b>0.8</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>9.7</b>	<b>7.8</b>	<b>7.4</b>	<b>6.5</b>
<i>Justice</i>							
Site 1					2	2	<b>2.0</b>
Site 2			34	51	31	39	<b>38.8</b>
Site 3			1	2	8	5	<b>4.0</b>
Site 4			3	2	1	3	<b>2.3</b>
Site 5					0	0	<b>0.0</b>
Site 6	0	3	3	2			<b>2.0</b>
Site 7*	3	4	3	1			<b>2.8</b>
Site 8*	2	3	1	1			<b>1.8</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>7.5</b>	<b>9.8</b>	<b>8.4</b>	<b>9.8</b>	<b>6.7</b>
<i>Organization/Sustainability</i>							
Site 1					2	2	<b>2.0</b>
Site 2			42	52	29	37	<b>40.0</b>
Site 3			7	5	2	8	<b>5.5</b>
Site 4			1	2	0	3	<b>1.5</b>
Site 5					0	1	<b>0.5</b>
Site 6	2	1	4	0			<b>1.8</b>
Site 7*	12	10	5	1			<b>7.0</b>
Site 8*	1	2	1	1			<b>1.3</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>10.2</b>	<b>6.6</b>	<b>10.2</b>	<b>7.45</b>
<i>Treatment/Service Provision</i>							
Site 1					6	3	<b>4.5</b>
Site 2			47	62	34	37	<b>45.0</b>
Site 3			9	20	14	22	<b>16.3</b>
Site 4			2	1	1	3	<b>1.8</b>
Site 5					3	1	<b>2.0</b>
Site 6	0	6	2	1			<b>2.3</b>
Site 7*	7	7	2	2			<b>4.5</b>
Site 8*	1	5	2	0			<b>2.0</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>10.7</b>	<b>14.3</b>	<b>11.6</b>	<b>13.2</b>	<b>9.8</b>

\*Sites submitted training data on a monthly basis. Site 7 was unable to submit data for one month of Y2\_Q1\_Q2 and for 2 months of Y3\_Q3\_Q4. Site 8 was also unable to submit training data for one month of Y3\_Q1\_Q2

These findings indicate that, overall, the Evaluation Sites valued staff training throughout the duration of their grant-funded project period. Numerous trainings covering a board range of topics relevant to Juvenile Drug Courts serving youth were provided to staff at all Evaluation Sites throughout the duration of the grant-funded project period. Though some Evaluation Sites focused more on trainings provided by agencies other than RF NPO and NCJFCJ, in general, all sites adequately and diversely trained their staff to meet a variety of interests and needs for each Site.