
This report summarizes data obtained October, 2012—January, 2013. These data reflect formal training obtained by staff of Juvenile Drug Court: Strategies in Practice and Reclaiming Futures (JDC/RF) programs implemented in three Juvenile Drug Courts in the United States (i.e., the evaluation sites) as reported by evaluation site representatives. Data from the fourth and fifth evaluation sites has not yet been collected.

These data reflect formal training not including formal training on the Juvenile Drug Court: Strategies in Practice and Reclaiming Futures models. The data reflecting formal training on these two models provided to staff of the JDC/RF programs is being collected from the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges and the Reclaiming Futures National Program Office and will be reported in a separate training report.

### Formal Trainings Obtained Over Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>January</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Trainings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Staff Trained</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

January, 2013, number of formal trainings obtained by staff at each site varied from 0 to 10, and number of staff formally trained at each site varied from 0 to 40. Staff at one evaluation site did not obtain any formal training from October, 2012 to January, 2013.

### Type of Program Staff Formally Trained Over Time*

- Amount of formal training obtained by program staff varied across time in terms of both number of formal trainings obtained by staff and number of staff trained.
- Amount of formal training also varied across evaluation site. Overall from October, 2012 to January, 2013, the percentage of staff formally trained varied across evaluation site from 0% to 100%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct Contact with Youth</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The type of program staff that obtained formal training varied across time. For example, during October, 2012, 100% of the program staff formally trained were administrative and management, whereas during January, 2013, 63% of the program staff formally trained was staff with direct contact with youth, 24% was administrative, and 29% was management.

### Type of Program Staff Formally Trained Across Evaluation Site from October, 2012 to January, 2013*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Site</th>
<th>Direct Contact with Youth</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Some program staff serve multiple program roles. Thus, the type of staff categories are not mutually exclusive, and percentages within each month can sum to more than 100%. For example, the one program staff member who was formally trained in October, 2012 was categorized as both administrative staff and management and, thus, 100% of the program staff trained in this month was administrative staff and 100% was management.
types of formal training obtained by program staff from October, 2012 to January, 2013*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Training</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment &amp; Service Provision</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization/Sustainability</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Some of the formal trainings covered multiple topics. Thus, the type of formal training categories are not mutually exclusive, and percentages across type of training overall (in the preceding table) and within each evaluation site (in the following table) can sum to more than 100%.

**type of formal training across evaluation site from October, 2012 to January, 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Site</th>
<th>Justice</th>
<th>Treatment &amp; Service Provision</th>
<th>Organization/ Sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- From October, 2012 to January, 2013, program staff obtained three types of formal training: justice, treatment and service provision, and organization/sustainability.
- The majority (69%) of the formal training concerned treatment and service provision.
- The type of formal training obtained from October, 2012 to January, 2013 by program staff varied by evaluation site.
- Of the three evaluation sites whose staff obtained formal training, one site’s staff exclusively obtained justice training; staff at the other two sites mainly obtained training concerning treatment and service provision.

**Questions about this report?**

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