Investing in Reclaiming Futures
webinar for public agencies, policymakers, & foundations

Now that I have become drug-free and graduated from the drug court program, I am on the right track again. I plan to go to college to study computer technology, and feel confident that I will make it. I am grateful for having a “natural helper,” because it has opened my eyes. — Lakesha Piner, OH

"I look at myself and like who I am. I don't use drugs any more. I feel smarter. I respect myself."
— Cheyenne, 15, Dayton, OH

"They sent me to treatment. Helped me to get hooked up with people that are going to help me to change my life, help me get into a house that is structured, help me find a job and stay in school. And hook me up with good people that are going to help me instead of just going to jail where I'm going to get in more trouble."
— Olivia, Seattle, WA
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Outcomes for the Session

1. Describe the compelling need
2. Overview Reclaiming Futures model
3. Describe a state framework for Reclaiming Futures
4. Describe the role of public policy makers and foundations in the state framework
1. The Compelling Social Need
Opening Premise

The current juvenile justice system is not economically or socially tenable and systemic, evidence-based juvenile justice reform is needed now more than ever.

More than 100,000 teenagers are held in custody every day at costs ranging from $100 to more than $300 per day.

Few of these confined teens are serious offenders. Most are charged with non-violent property or drug crimes.

Juvenile incarceration rates are driven by juvenile justice politics and policies, not by juvenile crime.
What we know

- There are approximately 343,000 juveniles arrested annually for drug and alcohol related charges

- Substance abuse has contributed to triple-digit increases in the numbers of youth arrested for drug-related offenses in the last 10 years

- Almost half of all youth receiving publicly-funded alcohol and drug treatment in the U.S. are referred by the juvenile justice system
What we know

- Less than 10% of kids with substance abuse disorders can actually access treatment

- Prevalence rates for substance use disorders among young offenders varies from 25 to 67%

- For every dollar spent on addiction treatment programs, $4 to $7 is saved on drug-related crimes & incarceration costs up to 6x the cost of treatment.
“The study’s data make it clear that, for serious offenders, substance use and criminal offending are strongly linked. Analyses so far have also shown that substance use is a substantial problem in this group of offenders, few offenders are receiving treatment in the community, and treatment for substance use holds some promise for reducing offending if the approaches reflect best standards of practice.”

What we need: an alternate service delivery system

- No national standards to identify needs and deliver service

- Promising models still regarded as specialty programs: drug court, restorative justice, detention reform

- There is uneven use of evidence-based practices by treatment programs

- No standards to integrate care across justice and treatment, and other supports in teen’s life
What we need: excellence in adolescent substance abuse treatment

\[\downarrow\text{destructive use of substances}\]

\[\downarrow\text{related high-risk behaviors}\]

\[\uparrow\text{healthy life skills and options}\]

\[\uparrow\text{healthy life trajectory}\]

\[\leftrightarrow\text{families in a meaningful way}\]

\[\rightarrow\text{developmentally appropriate strategies, techniques, information}\]
What we need: recovery management

- We need recovery management for kids in the juvenile justice system
- We need to manage dynamics and systems unique to kids in the juvenile justice system
- We need to engage multiple systems to work on coordinating and integrating simultaneous improvements
What we need: relational rehabilitation

- Building communities
- Promoting youth development
- Changing image of teens in trouble
- Building connections between young offenders and community residents
What we need: more than treatment

- Programs don’t change people...relationships do.

- Successful programs build relationships

- Not exclusively within the program but across the community
part 2: Reclaiming Futures overview
Questions that guide community change

• What do youth struggling with substance use disorders and overlapping life challenges need to be successful?

• What would community-institutional partnerships look like if they were able to provide that?

• How can we move the system in this direction?
Reclaiming Futures

- More Treatment
- Better Treatment
- Beyond Treatment
Who We Are

We are not simply a program but a fundamental approach to creating a youth-oriented recovery system of care.

We are one of the earliest proven juvenile justice reform initiatives and the only one that provides a systemic approach to youth caught in cycle of drugs, alcohol and crime.

A systems intervention that is a restorative justice approach for youth for whom prevention efforts –for whatever reason, have failed.

Began as $21-million, five-year initiative of the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. Now past our 10th year with new investments by OJJDP, CSAT, Kate B. Reynolds Charitable Trust, and RWJF

Vision: Communities reclaim kids in juvenile justice through appropriate, comprehensive and individualized responses to substance abuse and delinquency.
Our Funding Partners

- Robert Wood Johnson Foundation
  10 pilot sites; 4 capacity sites, co-funding with KBRCT & Federal partners

- Kate B. Reynolds Charitable Trust (KBRCT)
  State capacity-building with 6 sites

- Office of Juvenile Justice & Delinquency Prevention
- SAMHSA Center for Substance Abuse Treatment
  9 competitive grants in 3 cohort groups
What we’ve done to date

• Created, demonstrated and evaluated a national six-step model

• Conducted research to establish implementation benchmarks

• Built curriculum and leadership program with best practices from around the U.S.

• Developed a National Training and technical Assistance Center to support the expansion and implementation of the model.

• Implemented the model across 29 diverse settings.
the Reclaiming Futures model

**Coordinated Individualized Response**

1. **Initial Screening**
   - If possible substance abuse is indicated, refer for initial assessment.
   - As soon as possible after being referred to the juvenile justice system, youth should be screened for substance abuse problems using a reputable screening tool.
   - Youth with possible substance abuse problems should be assessed using a reputable tool to measure their use of alcohol and other drug problems, individual and family risks, needs, and strengths. The primary purpose of an initial assessment is to measure the severity of alcohol or other drug problems. A second purpose is to shape an informed service plan.

2. **Initial Assessment**
   - If substance abuse is indicated, refer for service coordination.

3. **Service Coordination**
   - Intervention plans should be designed and coordinated by community teams that are family-driven, span agency boundaries, and draw upon community-based resources.
   - Intervention should include whatever mix of services is appropriate for each youth, perhaps including alcohol and other drug treatment, educational and preventive services, involvement in pro-social activities, and the assistance of "natural helpers" known to the youth and his or her family.

4. **Initiation**
   - Service initiation is a critical moment in intervention.
   - Consistent with the treatment standards of the Washington Circle Group (www.washingtoncircle.org), initiation is defined as at least one service contact within 14 days of a youth's full assessment. Initiation can be measured for the entire intervention plan or for each component of the plan. Service initiation should be monitored whether or not the intervention plan includes formal alcohol or other drug treatment.

**Community Directed Engagement**

5. **Engagement**
   - Youth and families must be effectively engaged in services. Engagement is defined as three successful service contacts within 30 days of a youth's full assessment. Engagement can be measured for each service component or for all elements of the service plan taken as a whole. Engagement should be monitored whether or not the intervention plan includes formal alcohol or other drug treatment.

6. **Completion**
   - Community coordination teams should specify how much of each service plan must be completed in order for the plan as a whole to be considered complete.

**Process Measures**
- Of all youth identified with alcohol or other drug problems at screening, how many get full assessments?
- Of all youth identified with alcohol or other drug problems at assessment, how many agree to complete an appropriate service plan?
- Of all youth who initiate a service plan, how many become fully engaged in services?
- Of all youth who complete the service plan as designed, how many are successful for at least one year?

**Outcome Measures**
- Of all youth identified with alcohol or other drug problems at screening who do NOT get full assessments, how many are successful for at least one year?
- Of all youth who initiate a service plan but fail to initiate services as designed, how many are successful for at least one year?
- Of all youth who initiate a service plan but fail to become fully engaged, how many are successful for at least one year?
- Of all youth who complete the service plan, how many are successful for at least one year?

*Success may be defined in various ways, including the absence of new arrests or new court referrals, no new drug use, reduced drug use, no subsequent referrals for drug or alcohol treatment, or some combination of these measures.
Creating a Team
### Evaluation: Significant System Improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Admin Indices</th>
<th>Yes*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Sharing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems Integration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaboration Indices</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Client Information Sharing</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Collaboration</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner Involvement</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Indices</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AOD Assessment</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment Effectiveness</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Treatment</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Integration</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Involvement</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-Social Activities</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Statistically Significant Changes

**Urban Institute and Chapin Hall**
### Implementation Index

#### Table One - Implementation By Stage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Procedures/Protocols</th>
<th>Evidence-based Tools</th>
<th>Staff Training</th>
<th>Data Capture &amp; Use</th>
<th>Communication /Coordination</th>
<th>Quality Assurance</th>
<th>Family Engagement</th>
<th>Community Engagement</th>
<th>Cultural Competency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Screening</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Coordination</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiation</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion and Continuing Care</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table Two - Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>System ensured consent and confidentiality of all youth and guards against self-incrimination across all steps of the program.</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All written policy/protocols/training materials incorporate language and practice that ensures cultural, gender and racial appropriateness, inclusiveness and equity.</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation team meets on a regular basis for ongoing assessment of process and outcomes for the purpose of performance improvement.</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data is systematically collected, readily accessible and used by implementation team on a routine basis to for performance improvement and reporting.</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal communication and documentation exists to track youth through the entire process and is used by the implementation team on a routine basis to for performance improvement and reporting.</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is identifiable leadership that advocates and sustains the focus on implementing the Reclaiming Futures model.</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a governance structure to guide collaborative leadership work and decision making.</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A comprehensive process improvement effort is in place to use rapid cycle testing to improve client retention and their fiscal solidity.</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table Three - Sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Area</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is an ongoing effort to incorporate Reclaiming Futures into jurisdictional level policies to ensure the institutionalization of the six steps of the model.</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding mechanisms exist to fully support the institutionalization and maintenance of the Reclaiming Futures model as a standard practice.</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are ongoing communications (media, events, training) about Reclaiming Futures to raise awareness and support for Reclaiming Futures.</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data on the efficacy of Reclaiming Futures is reported to the community, stakeholders and decision-makers on a regular basis.</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a designated staff with authority to spearhead sustainability efforts and there are sustainability-related performance outcomes</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Level Descriptions**
- Level 1 - Little evidence
- Level 2 - Progress evidence
- Level 3 - Consistent Practice
- Level 4 – Institutionalized
29 Reclaiming Futures communities

[Map showing states with Reclaiming Futures communities marked with stars.]

- **States with Reclaiming Futures:**
  - CA, CO, KY, MO, OK, OR, TX, WA

- **States without Reclaiming Futures:**
  - All other states
part 3 : the state model adoption framework
Why Reclaiming Futures is needed in every state

• Teens involved with juvenile justice are largely not being treated for drug & alcohol issues and when they are treated, the quality is uneven.

• A recovery management model demands that we move beyond treatment and positively engage teens involved with juvenile justice with positive opportunities to develop skills and community connections

• Redesigning systems for teens involved with juvenile justice leads to reduced costs and reductions in repeat offenses.
29 Reclaiming Futures communities

- States with Reclaiming Futures
- States without Reclaiming Futures

- States on this webinar

Overview | Need | RF Model | State Adoption | Role of Policymakers | Questions
Franchise or Open Source

- Fundamental Decision for all Initiatives is to decide to what degree is the innovation owned.

- Control lends itself to programs that can be replicated with a high fidelity, which means local implementation has limited degrees of Freedom.

- At the other end of the spectrum is the concept of “open sourced” where there are few (if any) controls placed on implementation.

- Reclaiming Futures has adopted a hybrid dissemination model based on a business planning process co-facilitated by MissionWise, a group based in Seattle.

- This model is to provide the capacity building services of the National Program Office with an intentional plan to transfer capacity to the States

Reference: http://missionwise.org
Dissemination & Not Replication

Challenge of spreading innovations is the consequence of two complementary but flawed perceptions that:

• dissemination is straightforward compared with the sophistication and energies required for creating the idea in the first place, and

• dissemination is simply a process of replication, reproducing carbon copies of the original idea.

Our experience points to the contrary: that dissemination takes a distinct, sophisticated skill set, and that successful dissemination is a process of *customizing the program to new circumstances, not replicating.*
Reclaiming Futures – Theories of a State Model

Overview | Need | RF Model | State Adoption | Role of Policymakers | Questions

- Systemic
- Cross Agency
- Evidence-based
- Leadership
- Government Commitments
- Philanthropy Commitments
- Change
- Leverage
- Scale
- Capacity Building
- Funding
- Policy
Pilot Programs
Creating a network of RF pilot projects allows for the development of a localized learning community and creates state-specific capacity for state-wide implementation.

State Leadership
Investing in sustained leadership at the state level provides the time required to institutionalize the RF model within the state infrastructure.

Data Collection/Evaluation
Creating common standards & processes makes data accessible, comparable, actionable & demonstrates effectiveness.

Policy/Resource Alignment
Changing policies to provide incentive for interagency collaboration & flexible funding to support a sustained process for implementing the RF model.

Durability of Change
Lessons Learned

- Cohort learning matters
- Sustained leadership is critical
- Sustained engagement is critical because change takes time
- Mantra is Plan, Do, Study, Act
- Early documented outcomes inform the process & build political will
- Collaboration is an unnatural act
# Model of Statewide Adoption

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RWJF</th>
<th>KBRCT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research &amp; Development</strong></td>
<td><strong>State Infrastructure Development</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| - 10 Demonstration Sites  
- Evaluation Studies  
- National Program Support | - 6 State demonstration sites  
- State Leadership Convening  
- Data Collection/Evaluation  
- Policy & Resource Alignment  
- National Program Support | - State Infrastructure  
- Sustainable Resources  
- Statewide Implementation  
- Customize National Support |
| 5+ years | 2 years | 1-2 years |
part 4 : role of policy makers & foundations
A Blueprint for Juvenile Justice Reform

“Across the nation, reports have documented broken justice systems that further damage youth at great cost to taxpayers and public safety. Public opinion polls show a desire for reform and support for rehabilitation. Focused attention on racial disparities within the justice system is also creating powerful incentives for reform. The time is ripe to fundamentally change the juvenile justice landscape…”

…those partnerships between states and counties, & foundations “are finding their investments rewarded with growing success.”

Youth Transition Funders Group
A Blueprint for Juvenile Justice Reform (2nd ed.)
State Model – The Role of Partnerships

work of dissemination

where you are

where you want to be
Local Policymakers

- Talk to each other (justice, treatment, community)
- Understand the pathway of youth through the JJ system
- Understand the cost of the current JJ system
- Self-assess your capacity for systems change
- Build a local team
- Inform, educate & advocate (it's bigger than you)
- Support the process with tangible resources
- Understand the RF systems change architecture
- Make a long-term commitment to system change
- Champion a youth-focused & strengths-based agenda
State Policymakers

- Create broad-based leadership (judicial, juvenile justice, treatment & community)
- Convene, engage & provide authority
- Ensure broad representation of all interests
- Encourage participation & keep participants involved
- Focus on performance, outcome measures, and evaluation
- Support the process with tangible resources
- Understand the RF systems change architecture
- Make a long-term commitment to system change
- Champion a youth-focused & strengths-based agenda
Funding Agencies & Foundations

- Convene, engage & provide authority
- Ensure broad representation of all interests
- Provide leadership, governance, and strategy
- Span the boundaries of nonprofits, government & philanthropy
- Provide a clear capacity-building model
- Develop clear performance indicators
- Understand the RF systems change architecture
- Make a long-term commitment to system change
- Champion a youth-focused & strengths-based agenda
Investing in Reclaiming Futures
Win – Win Outcomes

- Stronger community engagement
- Net savings to multiple systems
- Lower risk - previous R&D investment
- Established capacity-building process
- Upstream system redesign focus
- Pathway for technology transfer
- Clear exit strategy with legacy impact

“Successful partnership projects maximize the assets of both partners & produce benefits for both sides”

Summary Opportunity

- Change the way your community treats kids in the justice system with substance abuse problems.
- Help young people stay out of trouble with the law.
- Improve public safety and save money.
- Give young people the support they need—more treatment, better treatment and beyond treatment—to turn their lives around.
Questions
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http://reclaimingfutures.org
More Treatment – Better Treatment – Beyond Treatment
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