

Cross-Site Report: Informal Training - July, 2016 Eight Site Report

This report presents program evaluation findings of an integrated Juvenile Drug Court: Strategies in Practice (JDC) and Reclaiming Futures (RF) program implemented in eight juvenile drug courts in the United States (i.e., the evaluation sites). These sites were awarded 4-year grants by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) and the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Administration (SAMHSA) to implement a JDC/RF program at their juvenile drug courts.

To assess the informal training regarding JDC and RF obtained by staff of JDC/RF programs, the staff at each evaluation site were surveyed monthly regarding their use of informal training resources (e.g. websites, other staff members) to obtain information about JDC and RF. For three of the eight evaluation sites, staff were surveyed beginning in the 1st quarter (Q1) of the 3rd year (Y3) of their 4-year grant-funded period. For two evaluation sites, staff were surveyed beginning in the 1st quarter (Q1) of their 4th year (Y4), and for three sites, staff were surveyed beginning in the 2nd quarter (Q2) of the 2nd year (Y2) of their 4-year grant-funded period.

The following tables present the average percentage of staff (of those staff who completed the informal training survey) who obtained informal training per month at each evaluation site. For example, as indicated in the following table, on average per month during the 1st quarter (Q1) of the 3rd year (Y3) of their grant-funded period, 75% of the staff from Evaluation Site 1 reported obtaining informal training regarding RF.

Percent of staff who've obtained self-directed informal training regarding Reclaiming Futures (RF) and Juvenile Drug Court: Strategies in Practice (JDC) from ANY SOURCE

Evaluation Site	Model	Y2Q2	Y2Q3	Y2Q4	Y3Q1	Y3Q2	Y3Q3	Y3Q4	Y4Q1	Y4Q2	Y4Q3	Y4Q4
Site 1	RF	—	—	—	75%	73%	75%	79%	60%	56%	53%	39%
	JDC	—	—	—	76%	66%	61%	56%	37%	45%	40%	35%
Site 2	RF	—	—	—	67%	73%	63%	59%	52%	58%	45%	32%
	JDC	—	—	—	57%	45%	46%	48%	44%	30%	25%	23%
Site 3	RF	—	—	—	53%	43%	30%	30%	28%	24%	20%	12%
	JDC	—	—	—	49%	31%	17%	20%	26%	15%	14%	10%
Site 4	RF	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	73%	56%	73%	48%
	JDC	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	69%	52%	57%	35%
Site 5	RF	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	73%	66%	58%	49%
	JDC	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	55%	42%	39%	37%
Site 6	RF	71%	74%	43%	72%	58%	59%	43%	36%	—	—	—
	JDC	67%	44%	26%	44%	32%	34%	24%	15%	—	—	—
Site 7	RF	84%	68%	82%	72%	72%	69%	72%	58%	—	—	—
	JDC	66%	64%	73%	54%	50%	58%	50%	42%	—	—	—
Site 8	RF	87%	67%	67%	43%	42%	61%	63%	58%	—	—	—
	JDC	74%	63%	46%	39%	19%	44%	30%	29%	—	—	—
Cross-Site Average	RF	83%	70%	69%	63%	59%	58%	55%	56%	52%	46%	35%
	JDC	69%	60%	52%	54%	40%	42%	38%	41%	35%	31%	23%

- These data suggest that a substantial percentage of JDC/RF staff obtained self-directed informal training regarding the JDC and RF models from any source.
- The rates of JDC/RF staff obtaining informal training regarding the JDC and RF models from any source varied by evaluation site from as high as 87% to as low as 12% for training regarding the RF model and from as high as 76% to as low as 10% for training regarding the JDC model.
- Overall, more JDC/RF staff reported self-directed informal training for the RF model than for the JDC model.
- Overall across all evaluation sites, the percentage of staff who pursued informal training decreased over time. Training for the RF model decreased similarly (83% to 35%) to that of training for the JDC model (69% to 23%).

Site												
Site 1	RF	—	—	—	17%	31%	18%	23%	9%	10%	6%	7%
	JDC	—	—	—	6%	4%	18%	17%	0%	3%	0%	3%
Site 2	RF	—	—	—	6%	7%	3%	6%	6%	9%	2%	2%
	JDC	—	—	—	4%	2%	3%	3%	2%	2%	6%	4%
Site 3	RF	—	—	—	9%	9%	4%	6%	0%	6%	9%	8%
	JDC	—	—	—	7%	2%	0%	2%	2%	2%	0%	0%
Site 4	RF	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	18%	37%	19%	18%
	JDC	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	13%	33%	26%	18%
Site 5	RF	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	14%	13%	12%	8%
	JDC	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4%	0%	5%	2%
Site 6	RF	19%	15%	5%	28%	39%	17%	19%	6%	—	—	—
	JDC	5%	0%	5%	6%	27%	0%	11%	5%	—	—	—
Site 7	RF	27%	27%	40%	30%	31%	29%	18%	19%	—	—	—
	JDC	16%	17%	24%	28%	17%	17%	18%	12%	—	—	—
Site 8	RF	22%	8%	14%	7%	19%	18%	23%	16%	—	—	—
	JDC	11%	15%	3%	7%	0%	3%	3%	0%	—	—	—
Cross-Site Average	RF	24%	18%	22%	14%	19%	14%	13%	10%	12%	8%	7%
	JDC	12%	13%	12%	9%	6%	6%	8%	4%	5%	5%	4%

- Overall, a small percentage of staff at the JDC/RF evaluation sites obtained self-directed informal training regarding the JDC and RF models from the RF National Program Office and/or NCJFCJ.
- The rates of JDC/RF staff who obtained self-directed informal training regarding the JDC and RF models from the RF National Program Office and/or NCJFCJ varied by evaluation site and across time for both the RF model (40% to 0%) and for the JDC model (33% to 0%).
- Overall, on average across JDC/RF evaluation sites, the percentage of staff reporting the use of the RF National Program Office and/or NCJFCJ as an informal source of training varied over time from as high as 24% to as low as 4%.

Percent of staff who've obtained self-directed informal training regarding Reclaiming Futures (RF) and Juvenile Drug Court: Strategies in Practice (JDC) from OTHERS AT THEIR JUVENILE DRUG COURT OR ORGANIZATION												
Evaluation Site	Model	Y2Q2	Y2Q3	Y2Q4	Y3Q1	Y3Q2	Y3Q3	Y3Q4	Y4Q1	Y4Q2	Y4Q3	Y4Q4
Site 1	RF	—	—	—	52%	62%	53%	57%	40%	45%	32%	36%
	JDC	—	—	—	68%	52%	51%	43%	31%	26%	31%	25%
Site 2	RF	—	—	—	51%	44%	34%	41%	42%	35%	25%	15%
	JDC	—	—	—	31%	7%	17%	33%	25%	18%	9%	11%
Site 3	RF	—	—	—	33%	27%	18%	24%	22%	15%	18%	10%
	JDC	—	—	—	29%	22%	9%	15%	15%	15%	9%	8%
Site 4	RF	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	58%	52%	56%	48%
	JDC	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	53%	52%	57%	26%
Site 5	RF	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	53%	37%	16%	37%
	JDC	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	42%	28%	31%	31%
Site 6	RF	67%	41%	14%	56%	44%	49%	31%	31%	—	—	—
	JDC	57%	33%	9%	28%	26%	16%	7%	0%	—	—	—
Site 7	RF	64%	48%	41%	42%	34%	39%	32%	19%	—	—	—
	JDC	57%	46%	49%	33%	17%	25%	25%	11%	—	—	—
Site 8	RF	68%	47%	43%	32%	26%	50%	39%	29%	—	—	—
	JDC	63%	51%	31%	25%	15%	34%	26%	25%	—	—	—
Cross-Site Average	RF	66%	47%	36%	44%	38%	38%	36%	38%	35%	29%	26%
	JDC	59%	45%	33%	35%	21%	25%	25%	27%	25%	23%	15%

- A substantial percentage of staff at the JDC/RF evaluation sites obtained self-directed informal training regarding the JDC and RF models from others at their juvenile drug court or organization.
- The rates of JDC/RF staff who pursued informal training regarding the JDC and RF models from others at their juvenile drug court or organization varied by evaluation site and across time for both the RF model (68% to 10%) and for the JDC model (68% to 0%).
- Across time, on average, the percentage of JDC/RF staff who reported utilizing others at their JDC or organization as an informal source of training regarding the JDC and RF models decreased over time, from 66% to 26% for the RF

	JDC											
Site 5	RF	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	16%	16%	14%	17%
	JDC	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	20%	12%	24%	21%
Site 6	RF	14%	8%	9%	28%	32%	32%	24%	10%	—	—	—
	JDC	24%	4%	13%	17%	32%	19%	0%	15%	—	—	—
Site 7	RF	24%	36%	43%	38%	24%	20%	21%	19%	—	—	—
	JDC	22%	27%	37%	31%	27%	29%	21%	16%	—	—	—
Site 8	RF	21%	24%	14%	7%	11%	19%	14%	15%	—	—	—
	JDC	17%	27%	11%	14%	11%	11%	7%	25%	—	—	—
Cross-Site Average	RF	21%	25%	25%	15%	18%	16%	15%	12%	13%	10%	8%
	JDC	21%	22%	21%	19%	17%	18%	13%	14%	12%	13%	10%

- The rates of staff that pursued informal training regarding the JDC and RF models from people at other JDC/RF sites varied by evaluation site for both the RF model (43% to 0%) and for the JDC model (37% to 0%).
- Overall across JDC/RF evaluation site, the percentage of staff reporting utilizing people at other JDC/RF sites as an informal source of training generally decreased over time from as high as 25% to as low as 8%.

Percent of staff who've obtained self-directed informal training regarding Reclaiming Futures (RF) and Juvenile Drug Court: Strategies in Practice (JDC) from READING ARTICLES, THE RF MANUAL, OR THE JDC MONOGRAPH												
Evaluation Site	Model	Y2Q2	Y2Q3	Y2Q4	Y3Q1	Y3Q2	Y3Q3	Y3Q4	Y4Q1	Y4Q2	Y4Q3	Y4Q4
Site 1	RF	—	—	—	45%	54%	54%	52%	20%	28%	24%	7%
	JDC	—	—	—	34%	38%	32%	39%	14%	24%	9%	3%
Site 2	RF	—	—	—	55%	61%	46%	39%	31%	35%	23%	26%
	JDC	—	—	—	46%	25%	32%	33%	23%	27%	23%	19%
Site 3	RF	—	—	—	30%	22%	13%	16%	2%	13%	14%	8%
	JDC	—	—	—	15%	20%	9%	10%	7%	7%	9%	10%
Site 4	RF	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	41%	33%	43%	18%
	JDC	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	29%	39%	38%	35%
Site 5	RF	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	50%	41%	29%	33%
	JDC	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	25%	30%	26%	24%
Site 6	RF	29%	22%	17%	39%	32%	23%	31%	10%	—	—	—
	JDC	19%	22%	17%	11%	27%	10%	12%	5%	—	—	—
Site 7	RF	63%	60%	64%	49%	41%	45%	36%	24%	—	—	—
	JDC	46%	41%	54%	32%	27%	36%	25%	7%	—	—	—
Site 8	RF	65%	44%	21%	22%	23%	39%	38%	29%	—	—	—
	JDC	51%	27%	17%	22%	11%	21%	20%	12%	—	—	—
Cross-Site Average	RF	57%	45%	38%	41%	39%	36%	33%	28%	30%	24%	20%
	JDC	42%	32%	32%	31%	24%	24%	23%	17%	24%	19%	17%

- These data suggest that a substantial percentage of JDC/RF staff obtained self-directed informal training regarding the JDC and RF models from printed materials.
- The rates of JDC/RF staff who utilized printed materials varied by evaluation site for both the RF model (65% to 2%) and the JDC model (51% to 3%).
- Overall across JDC/RF evaluation site, the percentage of JDC/RF staff who reported utilizing printed materials to obtain information regarding the JDC and RF models generally decreased over time from 57% to 20% for the RF model and from 42% to 17% for the JDC model.

Percent of staff who've obtained self-directed informal training regarding Reclaiming Futures (RF) and Juvenile Drug Court: Strategies in Practice (JDC) from VISITING RF AND JDC INFORMATIONAL WEBSITES

Evaluation Site	Model	Y2Q2	Y2Q3	Y2Q4	Y3Q1	Y3Q2	Y3Q3	Y3Q4	Y4Q1	Y4Q2	Y4Q3	Y4Q4
Site 1	RF	—	—	—	42%	55%	58%	52%	31%	33%	31%	33%
	JDC	—	—	—	20%	21%	33%	17%	3%	13%	3%	0%
Site 2	RF	—	—	—	41%	32%	43%	32%	27%	40%	36%	17%
	JDC	—	—	—	8%	2%	11%	19%	17%	20%	17%	13%
Site 3	RF	—	—	—	30%	27%	26%	18%	13%	15%	18%	8%
	JDC	—	—	—	18%	7%	2%	10%	11%	7%	11%	7%
Site 4	RF	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	43%	41%	43%	31%
	JDC	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	38%	33%	19%	27%
Site 5	RF	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	46%	61%	49%	39%
	JDC	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	15%	21%	25%	17%
Site 6	RF	57%	60%	26%	39%	39%	33%	38%	15%	—	—	—
	JDC	24%	18%	8%	17%	20%	6%	19%	5%	—	—	—
Site 7	RF	67%	59%	80%	69%	61%	58%	64%	54%	—	—	—
	JDC	36%	40%	46%	44%	27%	35%	40%	30%	—	—	—
Site 8	RF	75%	55%	53%	29%	37%	30%	47%	45%	—	—	—
	JDC	47%	23%	24%	11%	4%	15%	10%	10%	—	—	—
Cross-Site Average	RF	68%	59%	58%	41%	40%	40%	38%	36%	38%	34%	25%
	JDC	37%	30%	29%	19%	12%	16%	18%	15%	17%	14%	12%

- The rates of JDC/RF staff obtaining self-directed informal training from visiting JDC and RF websites varied by evaluation site from as high as 80% to as low as 8% for training regarding the RF model and from as high as 47% to as low as 0% for training regarding the JDC model.
- Overall across evaluation site, more JDC/RF staff reported visiting websites for informal training regarding the RF model than regarding the JDC model.
- Overall, the number of JDC/RF staff utilizing websites for information regarding the RF and JDC models varied across time.

Site 1	RF	—	—	—	3%	21%	0%	18%	6%	16%	12%	3%
	JDC	—	—	—	10%	21%	18%	17%	6%	7%	7%	0%
Site 2	RF	—	—	—	49%	48%	26%	76%	70%	73%	32%	32%
	JDC	—	—	—	6%	9%	9%	22%	21%	19%	15%	38%
Site 3	RF	—	—	—	9%	7%	7%	10%	4%	11%	4%	0%
	JDC	—	—	—	14%	9%	2%	8%	4%	9%	4%	0%
Site 4	RF	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	20%	33%	19%	18%
	JDC	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	21%	28%	26%	18%
Site 5	RF	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	27%	16%	19%	23%
	JDC	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	18%	17%	15%	14%
Site 6	RF	29%	22%	17%	39%	32%	23%	31%	21%	—	—	—
	JDC	19%	21%	0%	11%	27%	6%	7%	10%	—	—	—
Site 7	RF	63%	60%	64%	49%	41%	45%	36%	29%	—	—	—
	JDC	32%	38%	40%	31%	23%	26%	21%	7%	—	—	—
Site 8	RF	65%	44%	21%	22%	23%	39%	38%	21%	—	—	—
	JDC	20%	27%	10%	10%	0%	10%	10%	13%	—	—	—
Cross-Site Average	RF	57%	45%	38%	21%	20%	20%	25%	19%	19%	12%	12%
	JDC	25%	30%	20%	13%	13%	12%	15%	13%	16%	12%	9%

Findings Summary

- These data suggest that a substantial percentage of staff of JDC/RF programs obtained self-directed informal training regarding the JDC and RF models . Thus, JDC/RF staff are self-motivated to pursue program-specific training even after years of program implementation and, consequently, having already gained first-hand knowledge and familiarity with the models and their implementation. The RF NPO and NCJFCJ as well as OJJDP and SAMHSA could capitalize on this motivation by providing more informal training resources. In addition, individual juvenile drug courts could capitalize on this self-motivation by providing staff time during their standard work week during which to obtain informal training.
- In addition, the data suggest that, overall, more JDC/RF staff reported self-directed informal training for the RF model than for the JDC model. This finding seems to reflect JDC/RF staff's familiarity with the RF model relative to their familiarity with the JDC model. All of the juvenile drug courts at the evaluation sites had been utilizing the JDC model prior to their OJJDP and SAMHSA grant-funded project period, but almost all were newly implementing the RF model with their OJJDP and SAMHSA grant-funded project.
- Some sources of the self-directed informal training regarding the JDC and RF models obtained by JDC/RF staff were utilized more than others suggesting that efforts to encourage self-directed informal training might be more efficient if directed at certain sources of this training more than others.
 - Overall, JDC/RF staff most commonly reported obtaining informal training regarding the RF and JDC models from others at their juvenile drug court or organization.
 - Overall, JDC/RF least commonly reported obtaining informal training regarding the RF and JDC models from the RF National Program Office (NPO) and/or from the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges (NCJFCJ). These findings, however, do not indicate that JDC/RF staff are not getting training from the RF NPO and NCJFCJ as most of the training provided by the RF NPO and NCJFCJ is formal, structured training as opposed to informal training.

Questions: Contact Monica Davis, Evaluation Coordinator at 520-295-9339 x211 or midavis@email.arizona.edu

Acknowledgements: SIROW wishes to acknowledge the contributions of the five evaluation sites and the evaluation partners, Chestnut Health Systems and Carnevale Associates, LLC 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: University of Arizona - Southwest Institute for Research on Women (2016). National Cross-Site Evaluation of Juvenile Drug Courts and Reclaiming Futures: Cross-Site Report: Informal Training - July, 2016 - Eight Site Report. The University of Arizona: Tucson, Arizona.

Disclaimer: The development of this report 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.