REPORT

Final Report from the Models for Change Evaluation

June 24, 2016

Beth Stevens

Samina Sattar

Michaella Morzuch

Douglas Young, University of Maryland

Laura Ruttner

Jillian Stein

Meg Hargreaves, Community Science

Leslie Foster

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

CONTENTS

TABLES

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Overview of Models for Change

Models for Change is an initiative of The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation to accelerate juvenile justice reforms and promote fairer, more effective, and more developmentally appropriate juvenile justice systems throughout the United States. Between 2004 and 2014, the Foundation invested more than $121 million in the initiative, intending to create sustainable and replicable models of systems reform. Models for Change has used several major strategies to promote reform:

- The core state strategy, a multifaceted model of comprehensive systems change, supported the development and spread of a range of innovations at the state and local levels. The strategy was implemented in Illinois, Louisiana, Pennsylvania, and Washington

- An action network strategy promoted the collaborative development of innovative responses to important problems in juvenile justice systems. Three action networks included teams from the core states, 12 partner states, and many local jurisdictions. The partner states were California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Kansas, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, North Carolina, Ohio, Texas, and Wisconsin

- A National Resource Bank, composed of nationally recognized experts in key areas of juvenile justice reform, was created to provide technical assistance to the Models for Change partners

- A set of legacy activities intended to sustain the momentum of Models for Change; activities include establishing federal partnerships to support broader adoption of Models for Change practice and policy innovations in specific issue areas

In June 2013, the Foundation partnered with Mathematica Policy Research and the University of Maryland to design and conduct a retrospective evaluation of Models for Change. The evaluation focused on the core state strategy, the action network strategy, and the national context in which Models for Change played out. This report is a digest and synthesis of several technical reports prepared as part of the evaluation.

Impetus and climate for reform. The administration of juvenile justice in the United States has gone through several distinct phases over many decades. A phase that endured from the late 1980s through the 1990s was defined by policies that made it easier to try juveniles as adults in criminal court and increase time in confinement for those convicted of crimes. By 2000, record numbers of youth were being held in detention facilities and other out-of-home placements. Beginning in the 1990s, major private foundations joined youth advocates to challenge the wisdom of criminalizing juvenile justice. For its part, the MacArthur Foundation funded the Research Network on Adolescent Development and Juvenile Justice (1996 to 2005). Seminal studies from the network showed that adolescents are less culpable and have greater capacity for rehabilitation than adults. These studies were cited in the 2005 U.S. Supreme Court decision that outlawed the death penalty for children under age 18. Along with research on the effectiveness of well-implemented evidence-based interventions, the Foundation-funded developmental research was said to pave the way for rethinking reform in the early 21st century.

A vision for fairer systems. As evidence mounted in the early 2000s to support separate systems of justice for juvenile offenders and adult criminals, juvenile crime rates fell, states recognized the harm and costs of juvenile confinement, and the efficacy of community-based programs was becoming clearer. Models for Change emerged at this propitious time, beginning with the Foundation's investment in the core state of Pennsylvania. The Foundation put forth a set of Models for Change guiding principles and reform goals that emphasized (1) the developmental differences that distinguish youth from adults and from each other as individuals, and (2) the societal values of individual potential, mutual responsibility, and public safety.

Core state strategy. The long-term objectives of the Models for Change core state strategy were to foster comprehensive juvenile justice reform in targeted sites, and to produce models, tools, and resources that other sites could use and replicate. The strategy assumed that (1) juvenile justice reform would be accomplished through a multifaceted approach to specific targeted areas for improvement (TAIs) that could be leveraged to stimulate system-wide reforms; (2) states could make progress from a variety of starting points and relative strengths; and (3) because change is unpredictable over time, the core states would have to adapt to opportunities and challenges as they arose.

From 2004 to 2006, the Foundation invited first Pennsylvania, and then Illinois, Washington, and Louisiana to join Models for Change. The Foundation selected a "lead entity" organization to manage the initiative in each state. In addition to geographic diversity, the four core states represented different needs, opportunities, and capacities for reform, and potentially different spheres of influence in other locations. Core state funding covered six to 10 years of planning and implementation, depending on the state.

Action network strategy. The three action networks created in 2007 and 2008 functioned as learning communities. Led by a designated coordinating organization, teams from states and localities worked together to develop targeted projects that addressed a key issue. Launched several years after the start of Models for Change, the action networks were meant to enlarge the number of states that were engaged in the Foundation's approach to juvenile justice reform. Action networks operated for about four years.

Targeted areas for improvement. As noted, Models for Change conceived of TAIs as crucial leverage points for reform. The four core states worked on reducing racial and ethnic disparities in their juvenile justice systems (this effort came to be known as the "disproportionate minority contact" TAI) as well as two or more TAIs of their choosing. Each action network focused on one of three TAIs, disproportionate minority contact, mental health-juvenile justice, and juvenile indigent defense (Table ES.1). The TAIs were:

- **Aftercare** refers to the services and supervision that juvenile offenders receive to re-integrate into the community after release from an out-of-home placement, including mental health treatment, substance abuse treatment, job training, tutoring, and probation supervision.

- **Alternatives to formal processing and secure confinement** assert that most juvenile offenders do not need to be formally processed or kept in custody to be held accountable or to prevent re-offending. Reforms may narrow the pipeline of youth entering the system;

prevent system entry at arrest or intake; or prevent further entrenchment by diverting youth during detention, adjudication, or disposition.

- **Disproportionate minority contact** reforms uncover and address the fact that youth of color are overrepresented in most parts of most juvenile justice systems and are more likely than others to move into the more institutionalized parts of the system.

- **Evidence-based practices** are demonstrated as effective and cost-effective ways to serve youth in their communities, as alternatives to formal processing.

- **Jurisdictional boundaries** define the age limits for juvenile justice courts, programs, and services. Reform seeks to raise the age of juvenile court jurisdiction and/or modify transfer laws so that youth are more likely to stay in the juvenile justice system.

- **Mental health** reforms recognize that many youth require mental health and substance abuse treatment to avoid future justice system involvement.

- **Juvenile indigent defense** reforms are meant to improve access to, and quality of, legal counsel for juvenile offenders with limited means.

- **Systems integration** reforms recognize that dual-status youth (those involved in the child welfare and juvenile justice systems) have unique needs that require coordination across systems.

Table ES.1. Juvenile justice reform efforts, by core state and action network

State	Illinois	Louisiana	Pennsylvania	Washington	Action Network
Targeted Areas for Improvement					
Aftercare			✓		
Alternatives to formal processing and secure confinement		✓		✓	
Community-based resources	✓				
Disproportionate minority contact[a]	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Evidence-based practices		✓			
Jurisdictional boundaries	✓				
Mental health[b]			✓	✓	✓
Strategic Opportunities for Technical Assistance[a]					
Juvenile indigent defense				✓	✓
Multi-system collaboration				✓	

[a] The core states had the option to pursue juvenile indigent defense and multisystem coordination and collaboration through Models for Change. Referred to as SOTAs, these areas were narrower in scope than the TAIs.

The retrospective evaluation

Objectives and focus. The retrospective evaluation of Models for Change was designed to position Models for Change in a national context, assess the extent and nature of systems reform in the core states, and understand whether and how action networks generated change.

Given these objectives, the evaluation used primarily qualitative methods to document, understand, and describe the planning and implementation, and accomplishments and challenges, of Models for Change. The scope and complexity of the initiative required the Foundation and the evaluation team to make choices about focusing the evaluation. For example, during site visits to the four core states, the evaluation team visited the capitol or other policy-making center as well as at least two counties that were active in local reforms. During these visits, the evaluation teams concentrated on gathering information about two of the major TAIs addressed in the site, allowing a cross-cutting comparison of eight defined efforts. In the face of time and resource constraints, the desire to study efforts deeply but selectively was chosen over a shallow and broad approach.

Studying Models for Change in retrospect, the evaluation team had little ability to rigorously assess the effects of the core state or action network strategies on youth outcomes—the ultimate goal of juvenile justice reform. The team did examine a great deal of secondary data and analyses on youth outcomes that were generated during the course of Models for Change. These analyses were found to not support causal inferences. Most used relatively weak designs, such as before and after trend analyses that do not account for the myriad factors that may influence youth outcomes in addition to Models for Change reforms. Nonetheless, when the qualitative understanding of Models for Change implementation and the quantitative data about relevant youth outcomes seemed to reasonably support a common narrative, the evaluation notes such suggestive evidence. For the most part, however, the evaluation focused on systems change, rather than youth outcomes.

Data and methods. The evaluation had four components: a national context analysis; core state case studies; a cross-cutting analysis of eight pathways (or related efforts within a TAI or strategic opportunity); and an action network analysis.

The national context analysis collected and synthesized information from several sources: (1) a literature review of the major reports on juvenile justice reform over the last decade; (2) a limited review of juvenile justice legislation recorded in a bill-tracking database maintained by the National Center of State Legislatures; (3) interviews with experts in the areas of juvenile justice reform targeted by Models for Change; and (4) national juvenile justice data repositories. The three most important data repositories to the national context assessment were the National Juvenile Court Archive, the Disproportionate Minority Contact Databook, and the Juvenile Justice Bill Tracking Database.

The other three evaluation components drew largely from the following major data sources:

- **Document review.** The evaluation team analyzed extracts of the Bennett-Midland Index of Progress database, as well as more than 100 reports, work plans, articles and memoranda from the Foundation and the four states. These documents covered the period of development before the start of Models for Change and continued after the end of funding when sites were summarizing their understanding of their progress.

- **Key informant interviews.** The evaluation team interviewed nearly 80 informants across the four states to obtain a broad picture of the Models for Change work in each state. The interviews covered the general reform strategies employed by the various Models for

Change participants; why the goals and TAIs were chosen; and how the juvenile justice system in each state was structured and who were the key players.

- **Site visits.** The evaluation team made three-day site visits to each of the states. As noted, each visit included the state capitol or major city where most state agencies are located and at least two counties that implemented reforms. The site visits concentrated on two of the major TAIs addressed by the site. The interviews covered the rationales, strategies, critical interventions, and challenges that the various Models for Change participants faced. Interview respondents included representatives of the state's State Advisory Group (SAG) which is the state agency responsible for allocating federal funds for juvenile justice work; other key state agencies; the judiciary; advocacy groups, county officials, community-based providers of services; and others involved in Models for Change in some important way.

Methods to facilitate comparison. In connection with the core state and action network analyses, the evaluation devised standardized measures of effectiveness that would apply even though implementation of the core state and action network strategies was (deliberately) *not* standardized.

To facilitate the comparison of significant efforts in the core states, the evaluation team documented 18 "pathways" that linked related efforts under specific TAIs or SOTAs and then scored them by five criteria reflecting the pathways' potential to trigger change or evidence suggestive of positive effects. The Foundation selected eight pathways to represent variation and increase the potential for learning across the sample. The evaluation team then independently assessed the individual activities that comprised each pathway on three indicators with broad applicability to states' systems reform efforts: reach, spread, and sustainability. *Reach* refers to the number or proportion of youth or other stakeholders that stand to be affected by the activities in a pathway. *Spread* refers to replication elsewhere, especially as the result of active dissemination. *Sustainability* refers to whether changes in practice or policy continued to exist or contribute to change after Models for Change. Once pathways were loosely ranked by the reach, sustainability, and spread they achieved, the evaluation team analyzed the data for factors that seemed to be associated with relatively highly ranked pathways.

To facilitate the comparison of action networks, the evaluation team rated each network activity or project as effective if it resulted in a change in practice or policy, was well-received by stakeholders, was replicated, was sustained beyond an initial implementation period, or was sustained with other funding sources. The evaluation calculated effectiveness ratios for each strategy, strategic innovation group, and network, and then analyzed the qualitative data for factors that seemed to be associated with relatively effective action networks and specific strategies.

Findings

Summary of accomplishments and challenges

At a time of national readiness for reform, Models for Change sought to facilitate and accelerate nascent reform in the core states, and to provide research-based tools and techniques so that the core states and the action network partner states and localities could implement effective, developmentally appropriate juvenile justice reforms.

Core state accomplishments. Key respondents in all four states said that Models for Change contributed to systems reform by bringing people together and supporting the various forms of collaboration that ensued. Lead entities embraced the notion that systems reform requires raising awareness, building knowledge, forming consensus, and eventually developing new skills among a host of stakeholders. Without Models for Change, states would not have achieved or sustained the time- and resource-intensive work of effective stakeholder engagement and activation. Key respondents in each core state went on to cite more diverse accomplishments, owing to different strengths and weaknesses at baseline, major structural differences in the systems they strived to reform, and their specific goals and strategies. (See the text box for selected highlights.)

Respondents in the core states were least satisfied with progress in the area of disproportionate minority contact. States and localities that now have high-quality data with which to monitor disparity know that it persists, mostly at pre-Models for Change levels. At the same time, respondents credit Models for Change with helping states and localities produce the data needed to understand and communicate problems of disparity to stakeholders; in this way, the initiative has informed the discourse about a topic with many intertwined causes.

Respondents expressed concerns that many aspects of systems reform progress are reversible. Many of those who experienced Models for Change are firmly committed to its ideals, but it remains to be seen whether incoming law enforcement officers, judges, probation officers, defense attorneys, elected officials and staffers will assimilate to the culture that Models for Change helped to shape.

Action network accomplishments. Judging from effectiveness scores that the evaluation developed, all three action networks achieved positive results with at least three-quarters of the activities they pursued. From the perspective of participants, the action networks were a highly valued experience. Respondents felt that the investment they made in the networks through their participation was worthwhile, and all agreed that they would participate in a similar endeavor if given a future opportunity. Many respondents said that participating in a network was one of the most interesting and rewarding experiences of their careers. (See the text box for defining network features.)

Core state highlights

Illinois key respondents said Models for Change provided resources for state-based advocacy groups to be effective coalition builders. They also said the state's juvenile justice council is stronger because of the relationship building and regularity of meetings that Models for Change enabled.

Louisiana strived to create a culture to support a less punitive juvenile justice system. Models for Change equipped the state with "technical expertise" and "created small successes" to build on. The initiative also made comprehensive stakeholder engagement a reality in Louisiana. Without the engagement of the state administration and "all the juvenile justice entities," reform in Louisiana would have been a "disjointed effort" and "much harder to achieve."

Pennsylvania joined Models for Change to accelerate reforms that were already underway. Key respondents said the initiative let the lead entity "bring all stakeholders to the table" and chip away at the "silo mentality" that had long characterized Pennsylvania's juvenile justice system. Moreover, Pennsylvania's Juvenile Justice System Enhancement Strategy laid the groundwork to plan for sustained success following the end of Models for Change funding.

Washington key respondents viewed the state as having a "fairly decent infrastructure in place" when it joined Models for Change, including the customary use of risk assessments and some evidence-based practices. The grant program, therefore, was an opportunity for "doing a lot of fine tuning to make [the system] better."

To create local change, all three networks used trainings as a way to directly engage the people doing the work at hand. Thus, training recipients included law enforcement officials, school officials who address students' mental health needs, and lawyers who represent youth to agency staff. All three networks helped their sites develop and share key resources and tools that they could use to shape practices and programs. The diversity of the sites and the types of partners that contributed to the development of these tools demonstrated the need to adapt tools to different contexts. The fact that networks made adaptations successfully allowed best practices to spread rapidly among network participants.

Action network highlights

The **juvenile indigent defense network** had a relatively narrow scope. Advocates in the network seemed to naturally gravitate to strategies that played to their own strengths—legislative and judicial advocacy and strengthening the resources available to the juvenile defender community. A less insular network might have been a more innovative network and, thus, better at overcoming external challenges.

The **disproportionate minority contact** network used a range of strategies and stakeholders. Network teams received intensive technical assistance to implement their selected strategies, chose evidence-based products to use in their sites, and approached reforms with community backing, increasing the traction of efforts. Still, respondents said some key players in their sites were not ready to productively discuss over-representation of youth of color in the system.

The **mental health-juvenile justice** network piloted and then spread several approaches to increase system capacity to identify mental illness in youth. All sites working in the same group were expected to approach reform in similar ways. This practice helped participants discuss pros and cons with a shared vocabulary and learn from each other, but it downplayed the importance of local context.

Complementary strategies. The core state and action network strategies amounted to a well-rounded initiative. Generous funding and time were strengths of the core state strategy. Core states were involved in Models for Change for six to 10 years, including time to identify root causes of system dysfunction; develop a theory of change; and plan, implement, or continue reform activities. The amount of time granted to core states also meant they would have the opportunity to see reform activities play out and affect other system components *and* address repercussions as needed.

By contrast, a common concern among action network respondents was the relatively short period of network operation (three to four years) and the high expectations for achieving results. Many sites joined a network without a predefined plan for how to carry out their goals, so they spent considerable time and effort in the planning process or in adjusting general strategies to suit their specific environments. With additional time, sites felt they could have made deeper impact or conducted more advocacy related to the changes they sought.

One of the often-mentioned benefits of being part of an action network was hearing how other states and localities have addressed concerns in their jurisdictions. The networks provided sites with different perspectives and ideas on how their system might work differently with changes in policy or practice. Respondents agreed that the connections made through the networks would not have been made otherwise, and certainly would not have been leveraged to the extent that they were. Because team members had the opportunity to work closely with peers in other states, they developed an appreciation for the work done in other places and were more willing to try those approaches in their own jurisdictions.

A few respondents noted that, before joining an action network, they felt isolated in terms of their challenges and believed that they had to bring about change on their own. Participating in the network gave them a sense of not being alone in their struggle and demonstrated ways that

they could find support for their work outside of and within their state. The networks brought together stakeholders within a state to work on issues that were of common interest. For example, one site brought key policy influencers at the state level to the same team; that team collaborated on writing legislation and passing it into law in a way that would have been difficult if the network had not brought the team together.

The national context analysis found that, over time, many states outside the initiative not only came to focus on the Models for Change TAIs, but they often pursued reforms through strategies that were also being used in Models for Change. This level of alignment was fostered by the MacArthur Foundation's intentional communication and dissemination efforts.

Effective core state strategies

In comparing eight pathways selected for in-depth analysis, the evaluation identified several factors that appeared to be associated with reach, sustainability, and spread.

- **Producing credible evidence about problems and solutions.** Models for Change pathways in which partners used data to drive decisions were more likely than others to achieve progress. Data were used to challenge long-held assumptions, advance change at the legislative level, and promote the adoption of evidence-based programs and policies.

- **Forging links between state and local juvenile justice systems.** Reforms more often were spread and sustained when state and local stakeholders interacted frequently and deliberately. By sharing information across levels of government, state officials acquired knowledge about innovations from the county system, and county staff better understood and implemented state policies.

- **Implementing multiple tactics to spur reform.** Effective Models for Change pathways comprised multiple tactics to address the same problem from different angles. One state's pathway on disproportionate minority contact comprised at least 11 different tactics to address the complex problem of racial and ethnic disparities in the treatment of youth. Some tactics helped reveal the existence of disproportionalities to key stakeholders; others helped counter unconscious biases in the system by designing and implementing value-neutral assessment tools.

- **Allocating resources for dissemination and replication.** Pathway progress also resulted from the proactive diffusion of innovations and best practices. Models for Change partners that allocated some funds to dissemination went on to develop implementation toolkits, provide training and capacity-building, and use contracting processes to encourage innovation among service providers.

Effective action network strategies

The following factors were associated with action network effectiveness:

- **Prioritizing objectives and strategies.** Having fewer or narrower objectives for the networks as a whole and for strategic topics may enable action network participants to be more focused and develop more effective solutions. This analysis suggests that the juvenile indigent defense network's narrower focus allowed the member states to collaborate on

effective solutions while pursuing their own state-specific goals. Sites in the disproportionate minority contact network attempted to address a larger range of issues. They may have been unable to pursue all of them effectively because attention, time, and other resources were spread more thinly.

- **Having freedom to customize solutions to fit local contexts.** When network members have more flexibility to choose the approaches that suit their context best, it may be easier to sustain promising initiatives. Even within a narrower focus, flexibility for states and sites to choose the programs and approaches that are best suited to their specific context may be an important factor in effectiveness. States in the mental health-juvenile justice network were asked to implement the same curricula or training using the same processes, and the results of these efforts were mixed in terms of traction and acceptability.

- **Paying due attention to structural aspects of systems reform.** The disproportionate minority contact network focused on improving the capacity of its sites to target and design reforms, which seemed to contribute to the effectiveness of sites' efforts. The network encouraged the formation of governing committees with broad representation that included community members, which provided the grounding perspective of families and youth who are directly impacted by reforms. Sites in the network were also required to collect data on disproportionate minority contact to help target reform more effectively. Sites reported that their engagement with the data and the results of that process forever changed how they approach policy reform.

- **Integrating network activities into existing institutions.** An existing institution can provide insurance against the inevitable turnover of human resources, provide access to institutional sources of funding, and act as a central point of convening for different parties interested in the same issues. Several juvenile indigent defense teams were able to embed themselves in organizations that were well recognized in the juvenile justice system, which gave their efforts longevity and credibility with other stakeholders. When teams are more widely spread across agencies and institutions, they may be more vulnerable to changes in priorities and less consistent in their messages.

Effective foundation strategies

Key respondents identified several ways that the MacArthur Foundation facilitated systems change throughout Models for Change. It did this by:

- **Providing leadership and vision, and letting states set their own agendas, including by:**
  - Funding the research that established that "kids are different" from adults, bringing that knowledge to state and local juvenile justice systems, and embarking on a collective discovery about how to change those systems
  - Putting forth a vision for systems reform that was politically palatable and balanced
  - Letting states develop their own strategic directions and work plans
  - Being willing to let reform evolve in the core states and for states to modify their strategies accordingly; Models for Change was conducive to innovation in this way

- **Creating awareness of problems and the desire to improve, including by:**

  - Shining a national spotlight on problematic state issues

  - Sending MacArthur Foundation leadership to meet with juvenile justice leadership in the core states, thus generating "buy-in from the top into the whole [initiative]"

  - Driving more and better collection and use of data, especially by stakeholders with little or no prior interest or experience in using data to identify and understand problems, identify the characteristics of target populations, or monitor progress

- **Creating and supporting communities of learners and doers, including by:**

  - Providing technical expertise based on research about adolescent brain development in in a core state that was just embarking on reforms when it joined Models for Change

  - Equipping states with a "set of specialists or experts to help advance the work" of systems change

  - Hosting national conferences that were valuable for the quality of the presentations and for the opportunity to network with national experts

  - Helping reformers develop enduring professional networks

  - Providing sufficient funding for state and local stakeholder engagement. Models for Change allowed states to convene the right people with the right frequency and make the interaction worth everyone's while

  - Fostering the professional development of local leaders into state and national leaders, thereby imbuing juvenile justice systems at all levels with the Models for Change ethos

Several respondents, keenly aware that the field of juvenile justice is still building a base of evidence and knowledge about how to attain positive youth outcomes, said the greatest missed opportunity of Models for Change was in not conducting rigorous evaluations of specific interventions piloted in the core states.

Models for Change was conceived by the MacArthur Foundation and then evolved over a decade, shaped by the Foundation, the National Resource Bank, the core states, and the action network partner states and localities. All these participants abided a set of guiding principles about a fairer, more effective, and more developmentally appropriate juvenile justice system. Crucially, they also took the position that systems change begins with culture change. They recognized that culture change is slow and steady at best; more typically it is a path that alternates between progress and setbacks. The time and resources that the key Models for Change participants devoted to culture change paid off when stakeholders throughout state and local systems largely accepted—not rejected or ignored—the new practices, approaches, and tools that Models for Change produced. Models for Change has not given the juvenile justice field, or any socially complex field, a simpler way to systems change. It has shown by countless examples that there are no shortcuts.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Overview of the Models for Change initiative and evaluation

Models for Change is an initiative of The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation to accelerate juvenile justice reforms and promote fairer, more effective, and more developmentally appropriate juvenile justice systems throughout the United States. Between 2004 and 2014, the Foundation invested more than $121 million in the initiative, intending to create sustainable and replicable models of systems reform.

Models for Change has used several major strategies to promote reform:

- The core state strategy, a multifaceted model of comprehensive systems change, was designed to support the development and spread of a range of innovations at the state and local levels.[1]

    - Illinois, Louisiana, Pennsylvania, and Washington were the four core states

- A learning community strategy was used to promote the collaborative development of innovative responses to important problems in juvenile justice systems. The strategy created three action networks that included teams from the core states, 12 partner states, and many local jurisdictions.

    - The partner states were California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Kansas, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, North Carolina, Ohio, Texas, and Wisconsin

- A National Resource Bank, composed of nationally recognized experts in key areas of juvenile justice reform, was created to provide technical assistance to the Models for Change partners. Further, through the emergent addition of partnerships with the National Center for Juvenile Justice, Bennett Midland, and others, the Foundation attempted to track and monitor the activities and progress of this work over time with an eye toward eventually engaging in an evaluation.

- A set of legacy activities intended to sustain the momentum of Models for Change. Activities include establishing federal partnerships to support broader adoption of Models for Change practice and policy innovations in specific issue areas, and the National Center for Juvenile Justice's web site on Juvenile Justice Geography, Practice and Statistics, www.jjgps.org.

In June 2013, the Foundation partnered with Mathematica Policy Research and the University of Maryland to design and conduct a retrospective evaluation of Models for Change. The evaluation focused on the core state strategy, the action network strategy, and the national context in which Models for Change played out. This report is a digest and synthesis of several technical reports prepared as part of the evaluation.

This chapter describes the theory of change that guided Models for Change and the targeted areas for improvement (TAIs) that were its foci. It also briefly describes the implementation of

---

[1] Models for Change was an emergent initiative. It began with a single state and grew to include four core states, 12 partner states, and many local jurisdictions.

the core state and action network strategies. Chapter II describes the data and methods used for each evaluation component, and Chapter III presents key findings from each component. Chapter IV summarizes the achievements and relative benefits of the core state and action network strategies, and offers practical lessons about how to generate systems change based on the experiences of the core states.

B. Theory of change

Models for Change grew from the MacArthur Foundation's longstanding interest and involvement in juvenile justice, its understanding of the causes and consequences of troubled juvenile justice systems, its belief that smart strategies could lead to tractable reform, and its willingness to make sizable long-term investments to see strategies implemented. The Foundation's theory of change reflects the Foundation's values and knowledge and articulates its assumptions about promoting reform.

1. The need for juvenile justice reform

The MacArthur Foundation began making grants to organizations in the juvenile justice field in 1996, when concern about rising violent crime rates among juveniles met with increasingly punitive responses by policymakers. A number of states, wanting to address public fears and appear "tough on crime," passed legislation in the late 1980s and through the 1990s that made it easier to try juveniles as adults in criminal court (Zimring 1998). By 2000, record numbers of youth were being held in detention facilities and other out-of-home placements.

In the 1990s major private foundations such as the MacArthur Foundation and the Annie E. Casey Foundation joined youth advocates to challenge the wisdom of criminalizing juvenile justice (National Resource Council (2013). While harsh and punitive approaches prevailed, the failure of those approaches to reduce recidivism or rehabilitate offenders became clearer. Visions of systems reform also became clearer. Reform proponents worked toward juvenile justice systems that would:

- Be developmentally appropriate and account for individual differences among offenders

- Engage communities and families and collaborate with other youth-serving systems, such as education and juvenile welfare

- Treat youth without bias, regardless of race and ethnicity

- Use evidence-based decision making and treatment

2. A gradually more favorable climate for reform

By the early 2000s a number of reformers and philanthropic organizations were amassing evidence to support their position in favor of reform. From 1996 to 2005, the MacArthur Foundation's Research Network on Adolescent Development and Juvenile Justice yielded influential research on the developmental differences between juveniles and adults, strengthening the case for separate systems of justice. Toward the end of the Research Network's tenure, several other factors made the climate for Models of Change propitious:

- Falling youth crime rates

- Increased recognition of the harms and costs of juvenile confinement

- Emerging evidence regarding the efficacy and cost benefits of community-based programs

- Shifts in media coverage and public opinion[2]

3. A vision for the Foundation's contribution

In launching Models for Change, the MacArthur Foundation developed a vision that (1) was guided by principles that would imbue a fairer, more rational system (2) set ambitious goals, and (3) recognized that progress toward reform would not be linear, given the entrenched problems of existing systems and the policies and institutions that perpetuated those problems.

The Foundation's guiding principles emphasize the developmental differences that distinguish youth from adults and from each other. They also emphasize societal values of individual potential, mutual responsibility, and public safety. The goals expressed in the initiative's theory of change stem directly from the principles (Table I.1).

Table I.1. The Foundation's principles and goals for juvenile justice reform

Principles	Goals
1. Fundamental fairness—All system participants deserve fair treatment	Be bias-free, and treat all youth, victims, and family fairly
2. Recognition of juvenile-adult differences—The system must account for the fact that youth are fundamentally and developmentally different from adults	Treat youth differently from adults
3. Recognition of individual differences—The system must respond to the development, culture, gender, needs, and strengths of individual system participants	Treat all youth as individuals
4. Recognition of potential—Youth are capable of change and positive growth	Work to help juvenile offenders realize their full potential
5. Safety—Communities and people deserve to be and feel safe	Protect offenders from themselves and others
6. Personal, community, and system responsibility—Youth must accept responsibility for their actions and the consequences of those actions; communities are obligated to support youth and help them grow into responsible adults; the system is a vital part of society's collective exercise of responsibility to youth	Hold juvenile offenders accountable for their actions in developmentally appropriate ways; facilitate community ownership of delinquency; collaborate with multiple youth-serving systems to improve programs and services

Sources: www.modelsforchange.net and Models for Change logic model, June 2009

4. The core state strategy

Within the overall theory of change, the core state strategy was designed to develop, promote, and demonstrate systems reform in targeted sites to support the long-term objective of fostering comprehensive, replicable systems change. Further, the theory of change implied three steps: (1) the models of change would be documented; (2) states, partners, and others affiliated

---

[2] The convergence of forces that helped set the stage for reform is summarized by Bryer and Levin in the 2013 report *The Comeback States: Reducing Youth Incarceration in the United States*, jointly published by the National Juvenile Justice Network and the Texas Public Policy Foundation.

with the initiative would produce tools and resources; and (3) the models, tools, and resources, would be spread through the initiative. Several assumptions informed the strategy:

- The goal of bringing about juvenile justice systems that produce better outcomes for youth and protect public safety could be achieved in different ways.

- Juvenile justice reform would require top-down activities (states acting in ways that affect counties), bottom-up activities (counties acting in ways that affect states), and the interaction of these activities.

  - For example, counties were expected to develop or adapt innovations in the treatment and disposition of youth offenders and demonstrate their effectiveness. State-level actors were then expected to spread and diffuse effective innovations through mandates and incentives and by setting norms and standards.

- Juvenile justice reform would be accomplished through a comprehensive and multifaceted focus on specific targeted areas for improvement— leverage points within juvenile justice systems that would stimulate system-wide reforms.

- States could progress toward juvenile justice reform from a variety of starting points and relative strengths.

- The implementation of ambitious reforms and the environmental and political change that occurs in states over time would generate unpredictable changes. Models for Change teams would have to adapt to opportunities and challenges as they arose.

The Foundation worked with national experts from the National Resource Bank (NRB) to select four states from different parts of the country that had differing needs, opportunities, and capacities to reform their systems. The Foundation then selected a lead entity that would manage and drive Models for Change in each state. The state reform plan described what a model system would look like, how the current state system operated, and then proposed how the state would move closer to having a model system. Given its assumptions about the nature of change and the need for states to adapt to political and economic changes over time, the Foundation gave the lead entity in each core state considerable time and leeway to design, develop, and implement juvenile justice reforms that would best embody the Foundation's principles and goals, yet fit each state's individual circumstances (as the lead entity was especially suited to understand).

5. The action network strategy

Three action networks were created in 2007 and 2008, several years after the start of Models for Change. The networks functioned as learning communities in which teams from a group of states and local jurisdictions would work together, with the leadership of a designated coordinating organization and expert technical assistance, to develop targeted projects that addressed a key issue. Compared to the comprehensive approach used in the core state strategy, action networks focused on developing innovations with systems reform as the ultimate goal. Actions networks were designed to reach more states and engage them in reform efforts.

C. Targeted Areas for Improvement

As noted above, the Foundation's theory of change hypothesized that targeted intervention points within juvenile justice systems would produce system-wide reforms if activated. Models for Change referred to these intervention points as targeted areas or improvement (TAIs). Following are brief descriptions of the TAIs and how they were addressed in Models for Change.

- **Aftercare.** Aftercare refers to the services and supervision that juvenile offenders receive to re-integrate into the community following release from an out of home placement. Services may include mental health treatment, substance abuse treatment, job training, or tutoring, in addition to probation supervision.

  - Models for Change sought to lower the barriers among different service providers in order to improve the coordination of services for more effective aftercare.

- **Alternatives to formal processing and secure confinement.** This TAI encompasses a diverse set of reforms that assert that most juvenile offenders do not need to be formally processed or held in custody to be held accountable or to prevent re-offending. Some reforms are designed to narrow the pipeline of youth entering the system such as through revisions to "zero-tolerance" policies in schools, others focus on preventing system entry at the arrest or intake stage, and still others are designed to prevent further entrenchment into the system by diverting youth at the detention, adjudication, or disposition stages (National Research Council, 2013).

  - Models for Change has worked to promote the development of community-based services to youth who are in trouble with the law as an alternative to incarceration. With good alternatives, youth can remain in the community and receive services in the most effective, least restrictive settings.

- **Disproportionate minority contact.**[3] Youth of color are overrepresented in most parts of the juvenile justice system. Once arrested, youth of color are more likely than others to move into the more institutionalized parts of the system.

  - Through improved data and intentional and targeted interventions, Models for Change partners worked to promote fair and unbiased juvenile justice systems that treat youth equally regardless of their race or ethnicity. They developed tools to promote objective decision-making, language and cultural competency, education and workforce development, and detention alternatives and nontraditional services.

- **Evidence-based practices.** Mounting evidence about the ineffectiveness and costs of incarceration has increased demand for alternatives to formal processing and community-based services. This demand has, in turn, intensified interest in evidenced-based programs and practices.

  - Using research and promoting the testing of promising innovations, Models for Change worked to establish programs that effectively change youth behavior and improve

---

[3] Disproportionate minority contact is the term the initiative came to use over time as short-hand for work that was focused on reducing racial and ethnic disparity.

emotional function. For example, evidence-based programs like Multisystemic Therapy and Family Functional Therapy have been found to produce consistently better results than traditional juvenile justice interventions. Models for Change also supported research on other promising programs and services.

- **Jurisdictional boundaries.** Jurisdictional boundaries define the age limits for juvenile justice courts and programs and services. In the 1990s a number of states enacted legislation that made it easier to transfer juvenile cases to adult courts. As the years passed, evidence accumulated about the negative impact of this practice on juveniles, and awareness increased about the relationship between adolescent development and emotional and psychological maturity. From 2007 to 2013, four states raised the age of juvenile court jurisdiction and a dozen reformed their transfer laws so that youth would be more likely to stay in the juvenile justice system (Brown, 2012; Daugherty, 2013).

  - Models for Change promoted research and tools related to keeping youth within the jurisdiction of juvenile courts instead of transferring them to the adult criminal justice system.

- **Mental health.** Youth in detention or juvenile correctional facilities have greater rates of diagnosable psychiatric disorders than adolescents overall. Some researchers estimate that up to 70 percent of detained youth have a diagnosable mental disorder and that 25 to 50 percent have co-occurring substance use disorders (Sedlak & McPherson, 2010).

  Over the past decade juvenile justice researchers and professionals increasingly recognize that many youth require mental health and substance abuse treatment to avoid future justice system involvement (Buck-Willison et al., 2011; Seigle & Walsh, 2014).

  - Models for Change encouraged the use of mental health screening tools and the formation of advocacy coalitions to build community-based mental health services, among other reforms.

In addition to TAIs, Models for Change supported two Strategic Opportunities for Technical Assistance (SOTAs). SOTAs were narrower scope than TAIs and geared more toward the provision of expertise than to direct efforts to engender systems change. The Foundation provided less funding for SOTAs than for TAIs. The two SOTAs were:

- **Juvenile indigent defense services**. Young people in trouble with the law have a right to legal counsel, but they frequently do not get the representation they need. Even those who do have lawyers may be inadequately represented, because of defenders' high caseloads, inexperience, and lack of training.

  - Models for Change partners worked to improve access to, and quality of, counsel for every young person entering the juvenile justice system. Models for Change supported policy advocacy on these issues.

- **Systems integration.** Juvenile justice experts widely recognize that dual-status youth (those involved in the child welfare and juvenile justice systems), have unique needs that require coordination across systems (Siegel and Lord 2004). Moreover, failing to coordinate across these systems is known to be costly for states (Fromknecht, 2014).

- Models for Change supported system integration and coordination to support change in related areas, such as foster care or the school systems, both of which can be entry points into the juvenile justice system.

D. Implementation

1. The core state strategy

From 2004 to 2007, the Foundation chose four states to advance its reform agenda and test the core-state component of its theory of change. Listed below in alphabetical order, states were chosen for a variety of factors, including leadership and commitment to change, geographic diversity, differing needs and opportunities, and likelihood to influence reforms in other locations. As noted in parentheses, core state funding covered 6 to 10 years of planning and implementation.

- Illinois (2004 to 2014) was chosen for its strong juvenile justice leadership, potential for collaboration, community and civic engagement, ongoing reform efforts, and receptivity to and readiness for change at many points throughout the juvenile justice system. Illinois had begun to work with the Foundation before the development of Models for Change. Illinois used Models for Change to reorient its system to treating youth offenders as juveniles and to providing support and services in their communities. The Civitas ChildLaw Center, at Loyola University, was the lead entity for Illinois Models for Change.

- Louisiana (2006 to 2013) had been reforming its juvenile justice system for several years when it was selected for Models for Change. In the 1990s, Louisiana had the highest juvenile incarceration rate in the United States, and was one of only 12 states to house its juvenile detention facilities within the state's adult corrections system. In 1998, the U.S. Department of Justice joined a lawsuit charging the state with chronic abuse and mistreatment of its population of incarcerated youth. In 2000, the state entered into settlement agreements, which were amended in 2003 and 2004 and dismissed in 2006, as a result of substantial improvements in youth safety and treatment. The Foundation selected Louisiana as a core state in 2005, but did not award the Models for Change grant until 2006, when it was clear that the state could focus on juvenile justice reform while recovering from Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. The lead entity for Louisiana Models for Change was the Health Sciences Center in the School of Public Health at Louisiana State University.

- Pennsylvania (2004 to 2012) was selected for its favorable reform climate, strong public-private partnerships, demonstrated success in reforms and considerable consensus on juvenile justice. Its philosophy and reform agenda aligned very closely with that of the Foundation. Building on strong leadership in its juvenile justice sector, Pennsylvania had already begun to transform its system in ways that were compatible with Models for Change principles. Thus, Pennsylvania used Models for Change to intensify ongoing work and accelerate reforms already underway. Pennsylvania's lead entity was the Juvenile Law Center, a public interest law firm based in Philadelphia.

- Washington (2006 to 2014) was selected for its demonstrated commitment to systems improvement through evidence-based interventions, use of evaluation findings, and cost-benefit analysis techniques. In its Models for Change work plan, the state proposed to use its well-regarded data system as a platform for juvenile justice reforms. Washington sought to

reduce the state's reliance on restrictive treatment settings and to improve the quality of the juvenile bar. Washington's lead entity was the Center for Children & Youth Justice.

Each core state was required to focus on reducing disproportionate minority contact and to identify and pursue at least two other TAIs to meet its systems-change goals (Table I.2).

The core states all experienced political and economic changes while participating in Models for Change, though to varying extents. Illinois had a Democratic unified government from 2003 to 2013 although its governorship changed hands midway through Models for Change. Louisiana had a Democratic unified government from 2006 to 2007, a divided government from 2008 to 2010, and then a Republican unified government from 2011 to 2013. Pennsylvania had a divided government during its entire participation but a two-term Democratic governor. Washington had a Democratic unified government from 2006 to 2012, but a Republican-majority senate beginning in 2013. The national recession that began in 2008 affected all states.

Table I.2. Juvenile justice reform efforts, by core state

State	Illinois	Louisiana	Pennsylvania	Washington
Targeted Areas for Improvement				
Aftercare			✓	
Alternatives to formal processing and secure confinement		✓		✓
Community-based resources	✓			
Disproportionate minority contact[a]	✓	✓	✓	✓
Evidence-based practices		✓		
Jurisdictional boundaries	✓			
Mental health[b]			✓	✓
Strategic Opportunities for Technical Assistance[c]				
Juvenile indigent defense				✓
Multi-system collaboration				✓

[a] The core states were required to address disproportionate minority contact plus two or more TAIs of their choice.

[b] Efforts to address one TAI sometimes spilled over to TAIs that states had not explicitly selected. For example, through their efforts to divert youth from alternatives to formal processing and incarceration, Louisiana and Illinois also identified youth with mental health needs who could be better treated in community-based programs.

[c] The core states had the option to pursue juvenile indigent defense and multisystem coordination and collaboration through Models for Change. Referred to as SOTAs, these areas were narrower in scope than the TAIs.

2.   The action network strategy

The Foundation created an action network for each of three areas: disproportionate minority contact, mental health-juvenile justice, and juvenile indigent defense.

Table I.3 provides a basic overview of the key elements of each network: the coordinating organization that led the selection of sites, coordinated meetings, and oversaw the general progress of the network; the sites selected to participate; the topics of focus for each strategic innovation group (SIG) formed by the network's members; and the years the network was active.

Table I.3. Key elements of the action networks

	Disproportionate Minority Contact Action Network	Mental Health and Juvenile Justice Action Network	Juvenile Indigent Defense Action Network
Coordinating organization	The Center for Children's Law and Policy	The National Center for Mental Health and Juvenile Justice	The National Juvenile Defense Center
Core states/sites	• Illinois (state and Peoria County) • Louisiana (Rapides and Jefferson parishes) • Pennsylvania (Philadelphia, Allegheny, and Berks counties) • Washington (Pierce and Benton-Franklin counties)	• Illinois • Louisiana • Pennsylvania • Washington	• Illinois • Louisiana • Pennsylvania • Washington
Partner states/sites	• Baltimore City, Maryland • Rock County, Wisconsin • Sedwick County, Kansas • Union County, North Carolina	• Colorado • Connecticut • Ohio • Texas	• California • Florida • Massachusetts • New Jersey
Replication sites[a]	• Seward County, Kansas • Montgomery and Baltimore counties, Maryland • Kenosha and Outagamie counties, Wisconsin • North Carolina Department of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention	Not applicable	Not applicable
Strategic innovation groups	• Data collection and analysis • Pre-adjudication • Post-disposition • Programs, culture, and community	• Front-end diversion • Workforce development • Family involvement	• Meaningful access to counsel • State resource centers
Active dates of the network	2007–2011[b]	2007–2011	2008–2012

[a]An additional three sites, called learning sites that did not receive direct funding but would participate in network group-learning activities included Lyon and Chase counties, Kansas; Prince Georges County, Maryland; and Cabarrus County, North Carolina.

3. Monitoring implementation and progress

In December 2011, the Foundation published an initial inventory of Models for Change investments and activities, based on the analysis of a database developed by Bennett Midland LLC (Griffins 2011). The inventory reflects the quantity and diversity of *inputs* (grants categorized by grantee; size; and whether the grant supported core state work, action network activities, the National Resource Bank, or research) and *outputs* (the types of activity the grants funded and resulting achievements or "progress events") of Models for Change. Key findings from the inventory include:

- Models for Change funding was about evenly split between the core states ($39 million) and the National Resource Bank ($40 million), followed by the action networks ($15 million) and research ($7.5 million)

- Publications, including tool kits, policy briefs, training curricula, and other documents, were the most commonly reported progress events in the data base. Publications represented 14 percent of progress events, or 326 out of 2,309 events in the database

- Other communication-related activities were also common, including media coverage (217 events) and professional conferences (227 events)

- The next largest groups of progress events (listed most to least common) in the database were in the categories of:

  - Program implementation, expansion, documentation, evaluation, and replication

  - Implementation of formal, curriculum-based training, education, and professional development

  - Improvements in data capacity, data collection, data use, or data reporting

  - Improvements in collaborative structure, including research partnerships, interagency agreements, and the formation of interdisciplinary groups to address policy objectives

  - Implementation of new standardized and structured screening or assessment procedures, or expansions of existing procedures

In contrast to the analysis of the Bennett Midland database, which breaks down Models for Change efforts into discrete and countable progress events, the analyses in Chapter III of this report consider activities in aggregate, so as to better examine the strategic purpose of the activities and what they accomplished.

II. EVALUATION OBJECTIVES, DATA, AND METHODS

This chapter describes the objectives, data, and methods used in each component of the retrospective evaluation of Models for Change: the national context analysis, the core state case studies; the cross-cutting analysis of pathways—or related efforts with an TAI or SOTA; and the action network analysis.

A. National context analysis

The national context analysis was conducted to support the Foundation's understanding of the broader landscape of juvenile justice reform in the United States. The analysis identified and described:

- The major trends in the juvenile justice sector between 2004 and 2014, including the paradigm shifts, policy changes, or practice-oriented developments.

- Important contextual factors affecting these trends, for example economic or budgetary swings, major political changes, or events receiving intense media attention.

- Ways in which Models for Change reform strategies and activities align with, or diverge from, the general trends in juvenile justice reform across the country.

The assessment collected and synthesized information from several sources: (1) a literature review of the major reports on juvenile justice reform over the last decade; (2) a limited review of juvenile justice legislation recorded in a bill-tracking database maintained by the National Center of State Legislatures; (3) interviews with experts in the areas of juvenile justice reform targeted by Models for Change and (4) national juvenile justice data repositories. The three most important data repositories to the national context assessment were:

- The National Juvenile Court Archive, which includes case counts at various stages of juvenile system processing and provides benchmark measures in two areas of interest identified by Models for Change, jurisdictional boundaries and alternatives to formal processing. The archive is maintained and updated regularly by the National Center for Juvenile Justice (NCJJ) from data provided by states.

- The Disproportionate Minority Contact Databook, which draws on data reported by states for the Court Archive, and provides statistics on the relative rate at which youth of different races are in contact with the juvenile justice systems at various stages of case processing, along with the stage-specific counts upon which these rates are based. Like the Court Archive, the Databook is maintained and updated regularly by NCJJ from data provided by states.

- The Juvenile Justice Bill Tracking Database, which is maintained by the National Council of State Legislatures and contains all juvenile justice legislation introduced in states since 2008. Bills can be searches by state, year, keyword, status (enacted, pending, vetoed, and so forth), and topic area, several of which relate to Models for Change TAIs.

B. Core state case studies

The evaluation prepared retrospective case studies of each core state. Each study used qualitative and quantitative data to document and analyze the strategies and implementation, outputs, and in some cases, outcomes of the Initiative's work in the four states. The major sources of data were:

Document review. The evaluation team analyzed extracts of the Bennett-Midland Index of Progress database, as well as more than 100 reports, work plans, articles and memoranda from the Foundation and the four states. These documents covered the period of development before the start of Models for Change and continued after the end of funding when sites were summarizing their understanding of their progress.

Key informant interviews. The evaluation team interviewed nearly 80 informants across the four states to obtain a broad picture of the Models for Change work in each state. The interviews gathered data on the general reform strategies employed by the various Models for Change participants; why the goals and TAIs were chosen; and how the juvenile justice system in each state was structured and who were the key players. These interviews sought the larger picture of reform in the states.

Site visits. The evaluation team made three-day site visits to each of the states. Each visit included the state capitol or major city where most state agencies are located and a minimum of two counties that were implementing local reforms. The site visits concentrated on gathering detailed information on two pathways of events for two of the major TAIs addressed by the site (Table II.1). Less detailed information was collected on the other Models for Change strategies implemented in the state. The interviews focused on an in-depth exploration of the rationales, strategies, critical interventions, and challenges that the various Models for Change participants faced in trying to reform those specific parts of the juvenile justice system. The participants interviewed included representatives of the state's State Advisory Group (SAG) which is the state agency responsible for allocating federal funds for juvenile justice work; other key state agencies; the judiciary; advocacy groups, county officials, community-based providers of services; and others involved in Models for Change in some important way.

Use of quantitative outcomes data. In preparing the core state case studies, the evaluation team assessed the extent to which available quantitative data and research showed evidence of a link between a given TAI or pathway and its intended outcomes. Although the sheer quantity of data was great, most data were not suitable for linking Models for Change activities to youth outcomes. For this reason, outcomes data did not factor formally into the assessment of what the core states accomplished. However, we do discuss this evidence in the core-state section of Chapter III as a means of adding further context and completeness to our findings.

Table II.1. Pathways selected for case studies and cross-cutting analysis

Pathway 1	Pathway 2
Illinois	
Jurisdictional boundaries. The pathway consisted of a sequence of legislative and policy efforts to expand the jurisdiction of the juvenile courts, support the separation of juvenile incarceration facilities from the adult prison system, and develop statewide leadership organizational capacity to support reform at the state and county levels. Strategies included: • Advocating for legislative and policy efforts • Improving statewide leadership for juvenile justice reform • Implementing improvements in the state's department of juvenile justice	**Community-based resources**. The pathway comprised a series of county-based policy and program work to expand and strengthen community-based services to generate models for reform in local communities. Strategies included: • The state's expansion of resources to communities • Investment in county-based efforts to build local capacity to provide community-based resources to youth • Testing community-based interventions and innovations for dissemination and spread • Promoting community-based resources through collaborations with institutions that refer youth to the juvenile justice system • Investment in multi-county efforts
Louisiana	
Alternatives to formal processing and secure confinement. The pathway conducted and used research to shape model diversion policies, local planning entities, and professional guidance to increase diversion for status offenders. Strategies included: • Reducing the reliance on secure incarceration of juveniles in state-run facilities • Providing professional development opportunities to educate juvenile justice professionals about alternatives • Using planning entities to assess and improve the use of alternatives, as well as coordinate approaches and strategies	**Evidence-based practices.** The pathway focused on legislative and policy changes at the state and local level to encourage the adoption and dissemination of evidence-based assessments, screenings, and treatments to support alternatives to the juvenile justice system. Strategies included: • Developing state-level infrastructure to implement evidence-based practices • Providing training to juvenile justice professionals on evidence-based practices, including the state's adoption of the Structured Assessment of Violence Risk in Youth (SAVRY) • Promoting evidence-based assessment, screening, and treatment tools
Pennsylvania	
Aftercare. The pathway comprised a series of policy, planning, tools, and guidance to ensure consistent, quality post-release supervision, services, and supports to integrate youth coming out of residential placement back into their communities. Strategies included: • Improving the likelihood that youth offenders released from secure facilities will reenroll in school • Increasing the occupational training options for youth offenders emerging from residential facilities so that they are better prepared for the labor market • Enhancing the consistency and quality of aftercare policies and practices across the counties	**Disproportionate minority contact.** The pathway focused on data collection and analysis to identify the locations and drivers of racial and ethnic disparities and model programs to promote the objective treatment of youth in the system and to reduce the disproportionality of youth of color at all decision points in the juvenile justice system (from arrest to transfer to adult court). Strategies included: • Improving or enhancing data collection capacity at the state and local level to promote data-driven decision-making and target interventions or strategy development • Identifying, implementing, and testing alternatives to detention • Identifying, implementing, and testing assessment tools to determine the risks and needs of youth independent of demographic characteristics • Enhancing cultural competency understanding and operations of law enforcement and the courts
Washington	
Juvenile indigent defense. The pathway, which the Foundation funded as a SOTA not a TAI, used policy changes, training opportunities, and local models for juvenile court practice to improve the quality of juvenile defense services and increase youth access to legal representation in court hearings and other legal proceedings. Strategies included: • Providing training and technical assistance for juvenile defense attorneys • Advocating for statewide policy changes to improve juvenile defense • Improving county juvenile court practices	**Alternatives to formal processing and secure confinement.** The pathway consisted of state and local policy shifts and planning entities to both reduce truancy and increase the diversion of truant youth from the juvenile justice system. Strategies included: • Developing state-level infrastructure to implement evidence-based programs and practices • Conducting state-level planning • Using the Becca Task Force (a coalition of stakeholders) to coordinate activities • Investing in county-level improvements in the juvenile justice system

C. Cross-cutting pathway analysis

The evaluation team and the MacArthur Foundation agreed it was important to focus the cross-cutting component of the evaluation on some of the most significant efforts pursued in the core states. To facilitate the selection of significant efforts, the evaluation team conceived of and exhaustively documented 18 "pathways" that linked related efforts under specific TAIs or SOTAs and then scored them by five criteria reflecting the pathways' potential to trigger change or evidence suggestive of positive effects. Starting with the16 highest scoring pathways, the evaluation team and the MacArthur Foundation ensured that the final selections would represent variation to increase the potential for learning across a sample of pathways.

1. Methods and measures

After the Foundation selected the pathways to include in the cross-cutting analysis, the evaluation team independently assessed the individual activities that comprised each pathway on three indicators with broad applicability to states' systems reform efforts: reach, sustainability, and spread.

- *Reach* refers to whether a pathway can and does affect a large proportion of system components, decision points, institutions, and stakeholders. Reach is knowable *a priori* in the sense that strategies can be designed to touch numerous decision points in a system, for example. But if a strategy has flawed execution or meets obstacles, the intended reach may not be achieved.

- *Sustainability* refers to whether changes in practice or policy continued to exist or contribute to change after the end of Models for Change funding.

- *Spread* refers to replication elsewhere, especially as the result of active dissemination; in the Models for Change core state strategy, policies and practices tended to spread from their original jurisdiction to additional jurisdictions in the same state.

The evaluation then calculated pathway-level indicators of substantial, moderate, or limited reach, sustainability, and spread. A rating of substantial means activities in a pathway had extensive reach, on average; or at least 67 percent of activities were sustained or spread. A rating of moderate means activities had medium reach, on average; or 34 to 66 percent of activities were sustained or spread. A limited or slower rating means activities had low reach, on average; or 33 percent or fewer activities were sustained or spread.

Once pathways were loosely ranked by the reach, sustainability, and spread they achieved, the evaluation team searched the data for factors that seemed to be associated with relatively highly ranked pathways.

2. Data sources

The three qualitative indicators of systems change are based on data from a broad set of sources: (1) an extensive review of documents produced by the Foundation, the lead entities of the core states, and the National Resource Bank; (2) site visits and telephone interviews with Models for Change partners and observers at the state and county levels; and (3) interviews with members of the National Resource Bank, many of whom provided consulting services to the core states and counties.

D. Action network analysis

The goal of the action network analysis was to explore whether the use of learning communities was a useful strategy for developing innovative practices and creating change on a selected set of key reform areas.

1. Data sources

The evaluation team used three data sources to answer the research questions for this study: (1) program and grantees' documents, (2) interviews with key informants from Models for Change core states and action network partner states, and (3) interviews with staff from each network's coordinating organization and technical assistance (TA) providers. If respondents who were interviewed primarily for the core state analysis mentioned that they participated in a network, then notes from those interviews also were reviewed for the action network analysis.

2. Methods and measures

To identify network features that may have contributed to (or detracted from) the achievement of network goals, the evaluation compared the networks across several dimensions – the choice of SIG topics, structure, collaboration style, the role of the coordinator and technical assistance providers, and the strategies each SIG pursued. The evaluation then assessed how these factors may have affected the choice of strategies, how the nature of the topic may have played a role, and ultimately how effective the strategies were in generating change in the system. The variations in the structures, strategies, and other network factors can provide insights into how future initiatives of this nature should be designed.

Similar to the cross-cutting pathway analysis, the evaluation needed measures of network effectiveness that would broadly apply to all networks, despite their different approaches and goals. Thus, using data from interviews and annual reports, the evaluation measured the effectiveness of each project or activity pursued by an action network as part of a strategy. Effective activities met at least one of the following criteria:

- Resulted in a change in policy or practice

- Was well-received by local stakeholders

- Was replicated in other counties or states

- Was sustained beyond the initial period of implementation (if relevant)

- Was sustained by funding outside of the Foundation

If data indicated that an activity did not meet these criteria and was not considered a success by respondents, it was rated as ineffective. If information about an activity was missing, its effectiveness was categorized as not known.

The evaluation also assigned each activity to a strategy based on the approach the state or site used to achieve its goals. Network participants used a total of 16 different strategies in their work, grouped into 8 strategy types (Table II.2). Information on activities was sometimes incomplete and thus did not support an effectiveness rating.

The evaluation calculated effectiveness ratios for each strategy type within a SIG, for each SIG as a whole, and then for each network as a whole. Based on these ratios, we compared how effective different strategies were for different SIGs and different networks, and how the various factors that differentiate them may have contributed to their effectiveness. Nonetheless, it is useful to bear in mind when comparing the effectiveness of the action networks that each had a different strategic focus and was structured and organized accordingly. The mental health and juvenile justice action network focused on developing new tools and resources; the juvenile indigent defense action network focused on field building; and the disproportionate minority contact action network helped states demonstrate replicable reductions in racial and ethnic disparities (a proof of concept approach).

Table II.2. Strategies used by action networks

Strategy type	Strategy	Description
Policy	Policy change	Major legislative policy or judicial policy change, as well as change in administrative (regulatory) policy or practice
	Change in judicial or practitioner practice	Change in how juveniles are treated or juvenile cases are processed in the courts, including probation, by law enforcement, and in juvenile facilities
	Advocacy	Sponsorship of or direct education on policy issues to build the political will of elected and executive branch officials
Research and Data Collection	Policy research	Use of data to identify problems and advocate for change, including tracking indicators of change, and building data collection and analytic capacity
	Data systems	Support of data system development and use, including building IT infrastructure and rolling out use of electronic recordkeeping
Standardized Tools and Dissemination	Standardized tools and manuals	Development and implementation of youth screening and assessment tools, manuals, templates, etc.
	Dissemination	Publication and dissemination of Models for Change materials intended to raise awareness or affect attitudes or behaviors
Training	Curriculum development	Design and development of curricula that can be used to educate and train lawyers, practitioners, families, or youth
	Workforce training/ development	Professional development training provided to juvenile justice staff and court employees, including probation officers and juvenile defenders and judges
Programs	Innovative program Implementation	Development and implementation of new program, service, or practice
	Replication of programs	Implementation of evidence-based or otherwise existing programs, especially community-based programs that are an alternative to detention or incarceration in new counties or localities
Infrastructure Development	Collaborative infrastructure	Development of collaborative infrastructure for state and local leaders (task forces, leadership teams, state advisory councils, state commissions, meetings or conferences, etc.)
	Networking	Creation of member associations, websites, or Listservs to promote networking between system practitioners (e.g., public defenders)
Community	Family engagement	Inclusion and engagement of affected youth and families in system reform efforts, including youth leadership development
	Community education	Training or advocacy to change the practices of community members that affect juveniles (e.g., training for school administrators)
Technical assistance	Technical assistance	Provision of technical assistance to <u>local</u> agencies by state agencies, professional associations, or National Resource Bank consultants

Source: AN interviews and annual reports.

E. Limitations of the evaluation

This retrospective evaluation of Models for Change was designed to assess the extent and nature of systems reform in the core states, to understand whether and how action networks generated change in participating states, and to position Models for Change in a national context. The great scope and complexity of the initiative and the limited time and resources available for

the evaluation made it necessary to focus the evaluation in the ways already described in this chapter; primary data collection and data analysis were geared toward eight pathways (two in each state), out of a possible 18. Although the scope of the evaluation was limited in this way, the selection of pathways reflected the Foundation's learning priorities. Moreover, the perspectives of key interview respondents were sufficient to support broad conclusions about the initiative's major contributions to systems reform.

The key limitation of this retrospective evaluation is that it does not support causal inferences about systems reform and youth outcomes. Models for Change was a complex, multifaceted initiative devoted to achieving systems change through myriad evolving locally driven efforts. The initiative was not organized specifically to generate primary data for an impact evaluation. Deep differences across states and localities in juvenile justice legal structures, histories, cultures, beliefs, and resources precluded extensive multi-site evaluations or cross-state comparisons. Models for Change operated on the principle that the most appropriate point of comparison was the site itself. In the secondary data on youth outcomes that was reviewed by the evaluation team, this principle was reflected in the frequent use of analyses that assessed change over time within a specific site. The weakness of such analyses is that they do not control for causes of change that are independent of Models for Change, including historical trends or short-term events, which can affect desired youth outcomes positively or negatively.

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

III. FINDINGS

This chapter summarizes the main findings from each evaluation component, the national context analysis, the core state case studies and cross-cutting pathway analysis, and the action network analysis.

A. National context analysis

The evaluation team conducted a national context analysis for the following purposes:

- To document paradigm shifts in U.S. juvenile justice that are relevant to Models for Change

- To identify contextual factors that affected juvenile justice policy and practice during key Models for Change years, 2004 to 2014

- To explore the alignment of Models for Change reform strategies and activities with national trends in juvenile justice reform.

1.   Paradigm shifts

In *Reforming Juvenile Justice: A Developmental Approach*, the National Resource Council (NRC) describes four stages of juvenile justice reform that have spanned the 20th and early 21st centuries. Of these, the third and fourth stages are directly relevant to Models for Change. Covering the late 1980s and 1990s, reforms during the third stage reflected harsh attitudes toward juvenile crime, a punitive approach to juvenile offenders, and a blurring of distinctions between juvenile and criminal systems of justice. The NRC report states, "Lawmakers across the country radically reformed juvenile crime policy to facilitate the adult prosecution and punishment of young offenders and increase the lengthy of confinement for those who remained in the juvenile system" (NRC after Zimring 1998). Such policies responded to an increase in violent juvenile crime in the late 1980s, including highly publicized gang killings and school shootings, and reflected doubts that the juvenile system effectively protected public safety. Policymakers who supported the punitive reforms of the 1980s and 1990s denied a core assumption that traditionally guides U.S. public policy—that children and adolescents differ from adults in ways that society must address to ensure healthy development (NRC 2012).

Youth advocates challenged the punitive reforms as they were introduced. In the 1990s, academic researchers and major private foundations—particularly the MacArthur Foundation and the Annie E. Casey Foundation—joined the advocates' call to return to rehabilitative models of juvenile justice, closer to those that prevailed earlier in the 20th century (NRC 2012). The Research Network on Adolescent Development and Juvenile Justice, funded by the MacArthur Foundation from 1996 to 2005, produced and examined research about policy-relevant differences between juveniles and adults. According to the NRC report, research conducted by Network members, along with other research on the effectiveness of well-implemented evidence-based interventions, "paved the way for rethinking reform" in the early 21st century.

The generation of sound scientific research coincided with falling juvenile crime rates. The decline began in the mid-1990s and reached a 20-year low in 2004.[4] Entering the fourth stage of reforms, policymakers and the public gradually became more accepting of the premise that juvenile offenders are different from adult criminals and that they should be treated in separate systems of justice (NRC 2012). Policymakers' willingness to change was partly pragmatic, as they confronted the high costs of incarceration and recidivism during the punitive era of reforms. Also around this time, advocates for racial justice highlighted cases in which youth of color were more harshly treated than white youth for similar offenses (NRC 2012).

In 2005, with juvenile crime rates still at a relatively low level, the U.S. Supreme Court outlawed the death penalty for youth under age 18 in Roper v. Simons. The court's decision drew on research on adolescent development and legal culpability from the MacArthur Foundation's Network on Adolescent Development and Juvenile Justice, according to the network web site and the NRC. In this way, as noted, the MacArthur Foundation's early investments in juvenile justice reform achieved major policy influence.

Significant paradigm shifts not only continued during Models for Change, they were propelled by it, as stakeholders in the core states and action networks attested. State and local stakeholders became more aware of the harms of detaining youth, particularly low risk youth, in out-of-home placements. The poor conditions that characterized confinement drew attention and litigation. Evidence mounted about the ill effects of formal involvement in the justice system. As these perspectives took shape, so did intentions to divert youth from pretrial detention and secure confinement and from the justice system entirely. As interest in diversion and serving youth in the community grew, evidence-based programs emerged as desirable alternatives to secure confinement and formal processing. Improving the quality of community-based programs was actualized through a mix of research that established evidence-based programs like Family Functional Therapy and Multisystemic Therapy, federal funding to help states adopt evidence-based practices, as well as state and local efforts to implement evidence-based practices.

Much of the policy- and practice-related developments that evolved in the areas of mental health and aftercare were also influenced by a focus on improving the quality of care juveniles receive and keeping them in the community. A number of state and local reforms, whether funded through federal or foundation-led initiatives, worked to assess the specific service needs of adolescents who come into contact with the juvenile justice system, and to identify service gaps. Coordination and collaboration within systems (e.g., between institutional and community corrections in the case of aftercare) and across systems (between juvenile justice, child welfare, and mental health to address the needs of dual-status youth and their families) were recognized as important ways to improve service quality.

While a sustained and fortified focus on racial and ethnic disparities also characterizes the years in which Models for Change was most active, most of the progress in this area involved increased awareness and understanding of the locus and magnitude of the over-representation of youth of color. Early advancements in addressing disproportionate minority contact involved the

---

[4] The Foundation decided to move into this issue area based on the best available data at the time. Because crime data become available only after a two-year lag, the Foundation's decision was made as national crime rates were peaking.

development of data systems that enable states and jurisdictions to identify and monitor disproportionalities. Moreover, inequalities in juvenile justice decision making became an agenda item for state and local stakeholders. Much work remains, however, in implementing targeted efforts to reduce disproportionate minority contact. While the national context analysis highlights the attempts of federal policy and foundation-led initiatives to spur reforms in this area, the literature, major trend data, and expert interviews indicate that change at a level affecting individual youth of color has been limited and localized.

2. Contextual factors

As noted, juvenile crime rates began falling about a decade before the launch of Models for Change (NRC 2012). The national context analysis identified several additional contextual factors that affected trends in the juvenile justice sector during Models for Change. These included economic and budgetary swings, major political changes, and events that received intense media attention. All these contextual factors influenced the direction and pace of reforms. Fiscal crises plagued states across the country, particularly over the course of the Great Recession and the slow recovery. Economic constraints meant less federal funding was available to support reforms. Moreover, the costs of detaining youth in out-of-home placements proved unsustainable, prompting budget-strapped states and counties to seek affordable and effective alternatives to out of home placement.

While federal funding through OJJDP and the Second Chance Act of 2007 have been important drivers of reform during Models for Change, the consensus across the literature and expert interviews was that much more federal leadership and funding is needed. A number of experts noted the decline in federal funding over the past 10 years as well as the lack of leadership in helping states and localities implement reforms. The 10-year period covered in this review spanned parts of the Bush and Obama administrations. While the experts who participated in evaluation interviews had hoped that the Obama presidency would lead to increased attention and funding for juvenile justice, most expressed disappointment that the Obama administration had done little to advance juvenile justice reforms during the Models for Change years. Finally, the analysis found shifts in the media's coverage and portrayal of juvenile justice issues. The shift has contributed to greater public awareness of the ills of punitive juvenile justice systems and spurred policymakers to initiate reforms.

3. Alignment with national progress

The final topic explored in the national context analysis was whether Models for Change reform strategies and activities influenced, aligned with, or diverged from, general trends in juvenile justice reform across the country. Interview data collected for this evaluation affirmed the NRC's assertion that, when the OJJDP's influence over juvenile justice reforms receded, the MacArthur Foundation and the Annie E. Casey Foundation "assumed the mantle of leadership."

In a typology of a dozen reform activities that characterize the current reform era, the NRC expressly links most of the states that are striving to improve (1) access to and quality of mental health services, and (2) the provision of quality juvenile indigent defense services, to the MacArthur Foundation action networks. The typology counts at least one Models for Change core state as among those pursuing five other activities: (1) developing system-wide juvenile justice planning and collaboration, (2) reinvesting in community-based programs, (3) retaining

juveniles in the juvenile justice system, (4) use of evidence-based practices, and (5) modifying sentence laws for youth. The typology says lawsuits prompted efforts to improve the conditions of confinement in 33 states, and credits Annie E. Casey Foundation initiatives with multi-state efforts to reduce detention and county-level efforts to improve services to dual-status youth (NRC 2012).

Overall, reform efforts enacted in Models for Change states were very similar to those implemented in non-Models for Change states. Many states outside the initiative not only focused on the areas that Models for Change targeted for improvement, they often pursued reforms through similar pathways. Likewise, the contextual assessment found that Models for Change and other states achieved systems change through similar means (that is, through influential case law, legislation, shifts in policy and funding structures). It seems likely that the MacArthur Foundation's communication and dissemination efforts helped bring about this level of national alignment. By funding ModelsForChange.Net and the National Resource Bank, the Foundation promoted the tools, resources, and lessons of the core states, action network participants, and the Foundation's other partners and allies, so that other states and localities could use and benefit from them.

B. Noted accomplishments in the core states

This section illustrates some of the important ways Models for Change contributed to juvenile justice reform in the core states from the perspective of evaluation-interview respondents who were most knowledgeable about their state's Models for Change goals and strategies, and who have a broad perspective of state juvenile justice reform. It also summarizes the relevant research and data available on youth outcomes that were included in the core state case studies. The findings focus mostly on accomplishments and outcomes associated with the eight pathways that were selected for the cross-cutting analysis (see Chapter II). This focus reflects the fact that the evaluation's collection of primary data and analysis of secondary data also focused on those pathways. In addition, given the emphasis that Models for Change placed on disproportionate minority contact, the section also describes each state's accomplishments in this area.

The dominant theme from the key respondents in all four states was that Models for Change contributed to systems reform by bringing people together and supporting the various forms of collaboration that ensued. Lead entities embraced the notion that systems reform requires raising awareness, building knowledge, forming consensus, and eventually developing new skills among a host of stakeholders. Without Models for Change, states would not have achieved or sustained the time- and resource-intensive work of effective stakeholder engagement and activation. As key respondents reflected further, they cited more diverse accomplishments, owing to different strengths and weaknesses at baseline, major structural differences in the systems they strived to reform, and their specific goals and strategies.

1. Illinois

In general, Illinois key respondents credit Models for Change with embracing and providing resources for state-based advocacy groups to be effective coalition builders. In addition, they said the state's juvenile justice council is stronger because of the relationship building and regularity of meetings that Models for Change enabled.

Jurisdictional boundaries

A key respondent credits Models for Change with shining a "state and national spotlight" on Illinois's practice of transferring youth who were charged with certain drug crimes to adult court, and creating a collective sense of urgency for reform. During Models for Change, advocates conducted education and communication campaigns to (1) eliminate automatic transfers to the adult system for drug offenses, and (2) raise the age for accessing the juvenile justice system from 16 to 17.

Outcomes analyses of parts of the jurisdictional boundaries pathway, though few, were rigorous and they showed favorable, comprehensive effects, on the order of what might be expected given the scope of the legislation passed as part of the pathway (Szany et al. 2012; Kooy 2008). For example, analyses of data in Cook County, where the vast majority of drug cases originated, showed transfers to the adult court fell by nearly two-thirds within four years.

Community-based resources

Respondents with knowledge of the Illinois Models for Change work to promote community-based resources said the initiative contributed to a new culture *and* new practices. Describing a cultural shift throughout Illinois, a respondent said, "There [isn't] a county in the state that doesn't have someone who understands adolescent brain development, evidence-based practices, screening and assessment, substance abuse responses, and dually involved kids. I think that reach has been met through Models for Change materials and convenings." The respondent also said the Illinois Juvenile Justice Commission's "very assertive approach to conferences, convenings, and conventions of the stakeholders," which Models for Change supported, contributed to change. Finally, culture change was evident in the state Department of Juvenile Justice. Thanks to Models for Change, the department is "at the table figuring out how to reduce unnecessary incarceration. … The department is at least an equal partner in reducing its own population."

In terms of changing practice, Models for Change funding allowed Illinois to test county-level programs and learn what worked. According to respondents, the learning made the state more confident when it later decided to allocate federal funding to sustain those programs. Programs that Models for Change funded in Peoria, Ogle, DuPage, and Cook counties all generated effective practices that now continue with federal funding.

One example, from Youth Outreach Services (YOS) of Cook County, provided encouraging results about using mental health screening in Evening Reporting Centers (ERCs) to link youth to services.[5] Beginning in September 2009, ERCs linked individual-level demographic and screening/assessment data with service information for youth. Among a group of youth who screened positive for mental health needs, 63 percent attended at least two sessions with the ERC-linked service provider. Two practices were found to be associated with this level of

---

[5] Mueller, Heidi, Hunter Hurst, and Stuart Berry. Cook County/Youth Outreach Services. "A Transition Update." Illinois Models for Change Community-Based Alternatives Demonstration Sites. National Center for Juvenile Justice, Pittsburgh, PA: August 2010. Independent analysis of ERC data provided by Jesse Helton and Joseph Ryan, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Children and Family Research Center.

attendance: ERC staff following up with service providers and helping families with paperwork. Helping with transportation needs and financial assistance were also associated with attendance. Youth who attended these behavioral services were less likely to violate probation within three months after ERC intake (15 percent had a violation of probation) than those who did not attend services (53 percent). Because data showed the importance of combining screening with actively engaging diagnosed youth in the program, coordinating services, and providing assistance with paperwork, these activities were sustained after Models for Change.

Disproportionate Minority Contact

Illinois Models for Change made limited progress in reducing disproportionate minority contact in the state. Efforts to improve data collection and data systems through Models for Change helped to increase understanding of the scope of the problem. In addition, passage of legislation to restrict automatic transfers of youth to adult court for drug offenses eliminated a major source of the disproportionate transfers of youth of color to the adult system. However, disproportionate minority contact remains a major issue in Illinois' juvenile justice system and more comprehensive strategies are needed to fully address it. At the state level, disproportionate minority contact does not appear to have changed during the Initiative. Comparisons before and during Models for Change showed slightly greater disparities for African Americans and Latinos at the detention stage, and no changes at arrest or confinement.

2. Louisiana

As Louisiana strived to create a culture to support a less punitive juvenile justice system, Models for Change equipped the state with "technical expertise" and "created small successes" that the state could build on. The initiative also made comprehensive stakeholder engagement a reality in Louisiana. Without the engagement of the state administration and "all the juvenile justice entities," reform in Louisiana would have been a "disjointed effort" and "much harder to achieve."

Alternatives to formal processing and secure confinement

Key respondents said the contributions of Models for Change to Louisiana's use of alternatives to formal processing and secure confinement were two-fold, with comprehensive stakeholder education paving the way to better decision making by the state. The Louisiana Models for Change lead entity conducted stakeholder education through a sequence of sessions that focused on: (1) national best practices in juvenile justice, (2) the importance and use of evidence-based practices in juvenile justice, and (3) next steps for a better system in Louisiana. Eventually, the state's work with the Models for Change National Resource Bank influenced the state's decisions about policy and use of resources. Whereas the state might have "spent money on electronic monitoring or increasing the size of our detention facilities," one key respondent explained, Models for Change has taught Louisiana that there are better ways to "reduce recidivism and get better outcomes."

The new way of thinking was reflected in reforms to Louisiana's Families in Need of Services (FINS) program. In 2011, the state passed a resolution to create a FINS commission and conduct a legislative study. The commission received technical assistance from Louisiana Models for Change about reforming the state's approach to status offenses. Calcasieu, Jefferson,

and Rapides parishes served as models for the commission, having reduced the numbers of youth processed through the FINS system for status offenses between 2006 and 2010. In Rapides Parish in particular, Louisiana Models for Change focused on reducing status offense referrals from schools to juvenile court by diverting virtually all referrals to community programs and supports.

The commission's final report (issued in January 2012) recommended limiting the use of detention for youth who commit status offenses; using alternatives to detention and appropriate graduated sanctions; and gathering and analyzing data related to the FINS system to track outcomes. To ensure courts and detention are last resorts for FINS cases, additional legislation (Act 660) in 2012 required the FINS referral source to document steps taken and services provided before referral to court.[6] In addition, to ensure the implementation of the FINS commission recommendations, House Concurrent Resolution 129 was passed unanimously and enacted into law.[7] This resolution restated the recommendations of the FINS Commission, and required the state's five child-serving agencies to prepare a formal report on the accomplishments and status of implementation of the recommendations.

Evidence-based practices

Key respondents cited several accomplishments related to Louisiana's efforts to adopt evidenced-based practices. They included:

- The Office of Juvenile Justice's incremental introduction of contracting processes that require service providers to use evidence-based practices

- The introduction and integration of objective assessment of youth propensity for delinquency and violence. The assessment tool (known by its acronym, SAVRY) is administered by parole and probation officers, who share results with judges. Both parties have been receptive to the tool and judges reportedly became more likely to trust the parole or probation officer's recommendation if an assessment had been administered

- Community-level outreach to make local stakeholders aware of "what [evidence-based practice] models were out there, what was their effectiveness, and then helping communities navigate to … make that leap" to a new practice

Numerous contributions from researchers at the Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center and other University of Louisiana campuses, as well as the National Resource Bank, provide high quality outcomes data on the results of the efforts to expand evidence-based practices in the state. These results are largely consistent with the findings from the evaluation's qualitative data, suggesting that this pathway may have generated systems changes that ultimately benefited youth outcomes.

---

[6] Senate Bill 467, sponsored by Senator Sharon Weston Broome, provided for the adoption of due diligence and documentation requirements in order to allow the informal FINS system to better fulfill its mission of providing the needed services to youth and families by having a clear documentation of case history; Act 660 was signed into law August 1, 2012. Available at http://www.legis.la.gov/legis/BillInfo.aspx?i=220407.

[7] In Louisiana, concurrent resolutions do not require the signature of the governor.

In the first place, an extensive survey of juvenile justice system providers (probation, judiciary, prosecutors, and other court staff) helped track the adoption of evidence-based practices. Baseline and follow-up results showed increases in the number of youth administered standardized screening instruments (up by 34 percent), the number of youth screened for mental health needs (up 35 percent), and in the proportion of providers delivering programs supported with high-quality external research (more than doubled, from 19 to 46 percent) (Phillippi and Arteaga 2011).

Local evaluations of evidence-based practices included outcome studies of the 4th Judicial District's Teen Screen program. The program aimed to identify and link youth with mental health needs to treatment providers, and a more extensive prosecution-led effort to divert at-risk and truant youth through multiple assessments and risk- and need-based matching to community-based services. Findings from these studies were mostly favorable, but all were limited by their reliance on single-group or pre-post designs, and the absence of any external comparison group.

Disproportionate minority contact

The Louisiana Models for Change disproportionate minority contact reform efforts began in 2006 with an assessment of existing data. The assessment found that most juvenile justice agencies in the state lacked capacity to provide data on baseline conditions or evaluate the progress or success of the state's Models for Change reform efforts, including its efforts to reduce disproportionate minority contact.[8] Although Louisiana made strides in gathering and reporting race and ethnicity data during Models for Change, a 2011 UNO report showed little change in the system's overrepresentation of youth of color during the initiative.[9] As a Louisiana key respondent summarized, Models for Change created a "great awareness" and changed how stakeholders talk about the effects of detainment on youth through early Foundation-funded research on adolescent brain development. The same respondent said Models for Change has not yet had "direct impact" on "youth of color entering the system."

3. Pennsylvania

Acknowledging that Pennsylvania joined Models for Change to accelerate reforms that were already underway, key respondents credit the initiative with enabling the lead entity to "bring all stakeholders to the table" and chip away at the "silo mentality" that had long characterized Pennsylvania's juvenile justice system. Moreover, Pennsylvania's Juvenile Justice System Enhancement Strategy (JJSES) laid the groundwork to plan for sustained success following the end of Models for Change funding. JJSES is an ongoing effort to continue work on the state's reform agenda. Guided by key stakeholders closely involved in Pennsylvania Models for Change, the strategy uses relationships and lessons from Models for Change to provide the necessary support and coordination of juvenile justice reform efforts through evidence-based policies, practices, and data collection across the state. The creation of the JJSES can in part be

---

[8] "University Partnerships as a Strategy for Promoting Data-Driven Decision Making in Juvenile Justice." Models for Change Innovation Brief, December 2013.

[9] Institute for Public Health and Justice. "Juvenile Detention Screening Instruments: Determining Appropriate Placement for Young Offenders." Baton-Rouge, LA: Institute for Public Health and Justice, 2011.

seen as an accomplishment of Pennsylvania Models for Change, and as a continuation of Pennsylvania's long history of collaborative culture.

Aftercare

Pennsylvania Models for Change made progress in coordinating and planning for the aftercare system with the adoption of a state-level Joint Policy Statement on Aftercare that established and implemented a reform agenda. Reform efforts coalesced around the need to build linkages between residential placement and the community in order to ensure successful reentry and reduce the likelihood of recidivism.

The development and roll out of new tool kits and templates were also achievements in aftercare. Specifically, respondents said the Educational Aftercare and Reintegration tool kit was a major Models for Change accomplishment. The toolkit was a success in part because juvenile probation officers embraced it. They saw that it effectively reflected the "reason they got into the business in the first place" and made it easier for them to do right by youth. The tool kit equipped probation officers with knowledge of the legal responsibilities of school districts and thus dismantled a major roadblock to reintegration. In addition, Pennsylvania Models for Change developed a "single plan" template that placement staff and probation officers could use to determine the educational and therapeutic services that would be provided during placement and after discharge. Lastly, the development of the Pennsylvania Academic and Career/Technical Training Alliance (PACTT), which accredited, aligned, and improved the provision of academic and/or technical training that youth receive during and after placement was a major achievement. As of 2009, 54 of Pennsylvania's 67 counties were participating in one or more of these aftercare reforms.

Disproportionate minority contact

Pennsylvania Models for Change improved data collection at the state and local levels to enable better data-driven decision making and strategy development, and to then test interventions that improved the decision making and treatment of youth in parts of the system where large numbers of youth of color were involved. Although work to reduce disproportionate minority contact is ongoing, according to those interviewed, the mindsets of juvenile justice professionals have begun to change, detentions and recidivism have decreased in some areas, and some reforms have been sustained and spread to other parts of the state.

Philadelphia respondents cited the development and dissemination of a youth-law enforcement curriculum and the establishment of a graduated response court as important accomplishments during Models for Change (which built on disproportionate minority contact efforts that began in Pennsylvania in the late 1990s). One respondent said the graduated sanctions court "has definitely changed the way people are talking about responses to probation violations and thinking critically about what it is we are doing." The same respondent said the youth-law enforcement curriculum had been "institutionalized as something that the police department thinks is important." It had been delivered to about 18 percent of Philadelphia's 6,500 police officers at the time of the evaluation interviews. Moreover, the collaborative process of curriculum development "opened up avenues of communication that make a difference at other places in the system."

Available outcomes evidence on the Berks County Evening Reporting Center, a detention alternative begun under Models for Change, suggested that the center contributed to reduced use of detention, lower relative-rate index ratios for Latino youth, and improved attendance rates in court hearings. These secondary findings are fully consistent with the evaluation's qualitative data, offering meaningful, if suggestive, evidence that Pennsylvania's disproportionate minority contract not only made systems gains but also positively contributed to youth outcomes.

4. Washington

Washington key respondents viewed the state as having a "fairly decent infrastructure in place" when it joined Models for Change, including the customary use of risk assessments and some evidence-based practices. The grant program, therefore, was an opportunity for "doing a lot of fine tuning to make [the system] better."

Alternatives to formal processing and secure confinement

The most notable change related to Washington Models for Change was a statewide increase in the diversion of youth from formal processing and secure confinement. This was an important accomplishment, and the result of tremendous activity at the state and local levels. Major efforts included: (1) truancy policy research and policy development at the state level; (2) the development and spread of the Washington Assessment of the Risks and Needs of Students (WARNS), an early warning screening tool for truant and at-risk youth; and (3) testing and evaluation of innovative truancy diversion programs in the local Models for Change sites. Truancy diversion reforms took the form of school re-engagement programs, drop-out prevention programs, mental health screening and assessment protocols, community engagement initiatives, and replication of community truancy boards.

The state, some counties, and National Resource Bank members generated several evaluation reports on outcomes at both the local and the state levels. These reports generally showed favorable trends in outcomes, offering suggestive evidence that reforms contributed to the outcomes. For example, following years of steady increases before Models for Change implementation, truancy case filings fell 31 percent statewide from 2007 to 2011. In addition, truancy contempt hearing rates fell 28 percent after implementation. County-level truancy filing numbers also showed favorable outcomes over these same periods: Clark, down 36 percent; King, down 32 percent; Benton-Franklin, down 30 percent; and Spokane, down 11 percent. In a multisite cost-benefit analysis, local savings associated with the various truancy reduction initiatives were estimated to range from $22.6 million in Benton and Franklin counties to more than $100 million in Spokane.

Juvenile indigent defense

Washington Models for Change advanced juvenile indigent defense in three ways: education (the development of training and technical assistance for juvenile defense attorneys), state policy change (mandating juvenile defense quality standards and requirements for legal representation of youth at their first court appearance), and the creation and testing of new juvenile defense tools (including judicial colloquies and model contracts). The Foundation supported a special counsel position located at a Seattle-based legal advocacy organization to facilitate the work. In the special counsel's opinion, Models for Change introduced three qualities to juvenile indigent

defense that had been lacking in the state: a guiding strategy, shared leadership among county-based juvenile defense attorneys, and an appreciation of data. The special counsel said, "I just didn't see the value of [data collection]. I was the supervisor of eight juvenile defense attorneys. To me, data was making sure everybody got an equal number of cases. But I never looked at, or tried to gather, what are we doing, are we doing the best we can for these kids, do I need to change? I never really thought about that until MacArthur started showing me the value of data."

Relatively little research or outcome data were available to assess this pathway, resulting in little additional evidence on potential progress toward Models for Change goals. Studies of indigent defense initiatives are rare nationally, and quantitative data on the Washington juvenile indigent defense pathway were limited mostly to counts and surveys of people receiving technical assistance and attending training events. A respondent said, "By improving quality of representation, we're improving outcomes for youth. That's been our goal all along. And I'd like to say we have, but I don't know if I have data enough to say that." A lone exception was an evaluation of the Yakima First Appearance program, which compared release outcomes of cases heard during the program period and those heard in prior years (TeamChild 2012). A youth's release at initial appearance was two to three times more likely during the demonstration period than before.

Disproportionate Minority Contact

Washington Models for Change was instrumental in improving the state-level collection, analysis, and public reporting of racial/ethnic disparity data. This information was used in some sites to make incremental progress at specific decision points in the system. However, the evaluation findings highlight the need for: identifying and addressing decision making that leads to over-representation of youth of color, greater use of objective risk assessment tools, a more diverse and culturally competent workforce, and more effective engagement with communities of color in system reform. A Washington key respondent noted, "We've reduced the juvenile population in detention. At the same time, we've increased the percentage of disparity."

C. Lessons from the cross-cutting pathway analysis

To identify strategies associated with accomplishments and to glean practical lessons from the findings, the evaluation examined three indicators of systems reform—reach, sustainability, and spread—that would apply to most Models for Change TAIs and SOTAs, no matter what specific goals, strategies, and outcomes states pursued. This section presents the findings and lessons and explores whether the experiences of the core states validated the Foundation's theory of change.

As Chapter I described, the states that participated in Models for Change were selected to represent a range of characteristics at baseline. Each state had different capacity for reform and problems to address, each chose different strategies to address their problems, and each state pursued reform in specific environments. Moreover, the eight pathways analyzed were selected (out of 16 considered) to represent variation and increase the potential for learning across a sample of pathways. For these reasons alone it is not surprising to see considerable variation in the extent of reach, sustainability, and spread that each state achieved (Table III.1). In addition, the evaluation identified four practices that were conducive to progress.

- **Producing credible evidence about problems and solutions.** State Models for Change partners that used data to drive decisions were more likely than others to achieve progress in their pathways. Partners used data to examine their own and others' long-held assumptions, advance change at the legislative level, and promote the adoption of evidence-based programs and policies. For example, Illinois Models for Change used research to demonstrate that extending eligibility for juvenile court to committed felons younger than 18 was likely to reduce costs. The use of research helped generate changes to laws governing age limits for juvenile status. A Pennsylvania community was surprised by arrest data that showed increased arrests during the school day. Determining that the arrests involved youth who had been suspended from school and were on their own, the community developed a resource center to give youth a structured program during suspension and during school hours.

Table III.1. Progress toward systems change, by pathway and strategy

Pathways and strategies	Reach		Sustain-ability		Spread	
	Relevant TAIs	Level of progress	Relevant activities	Level of Progress	Relevant activities	Level of progress
Substantial progress						
Pennsylvania disproportionate minority contact						
Improve data collection and use at state and local levels	8	(yellow)	10	(yellow)	12	(red)
Identify, implement, and test alternatives to detention	2	(green)	7	(green)	7	(yellow)
Identify, implement, and test assessment tools	2	(green)	4	(green)	4	(green)
Enhance cultural competency of law enforcement and the courts	1	(green)	4	(green)	4	(yellow)
Louisiana evidence-based practices (EBPs)						
Develop state infrastructure to implement EBPs	3	(green)	6	(green)	6	(red)
Train juvenile justice professionals on EBPs	3	(green)	5	(yellow)	5	(red)
Identify and promote evidence-based assessment and treatment	3	(yellow)	20	(yellow)	19	(red)
Pennsylvania aftercare						
Increase schools' acceptance of youth after placement/detention	3	(yellow)	5	(yellow)	5	(red)
Increase occupational training options for newly released youth	3	(yellow)	8	(green)	8	(green)
Enhance cross-county consistency of policies and practices	1	(green)	6	(green)	6	(green)
Moderate progress						
Washington alternatives to formal processing & secure confinement						
State-level planning	2	(green)	7	(red)	7	(red)
Activities conducted by the Becca Task Force	4	(green)	7	(yellow)	6	(red)
County-level improvements in the juvenile justice system	5	(green)	23	(yellow)	23	(red)
Illinois jurisdictional boundaries						
Legislative and policy efforts	2	(yellow)	17	(green)	0	N/A
Efforts to improve state leadership	1	(yellow)	10	(yellow)	6	(red)
Efforts to improve the treatment of youth in Dept. of Juv. Justice	2	(green)	13	(green)	5	(red)
Limited or slower progress						
Illinois community-based resources						
State-based actions to expand resources for communities	1	(yellow)	5	(yellow)	5	(yellow)
County-based actions to build local capacity	1	(yellow)	8	(yellow)	7	(red)
Testing innovative practices	3	(yellow)	5	(green)	5	(yellow)
Collaboration with institutions that refer youth to the system	2	(yellow)	8	(yellow)	8	(yellow)
Multicounty efforts to improve services for subpopulations	2	(green)	3	(red)	3	(red)
Louisiana alternatives to formal processing & secure confinement						
Reduce reliance on secure incarceration	3	(green)	3	(yellow)	3	(yellow)
Educate juvenile justice professionals about alternatives	3	(yellow)	8	(yellow)	8	(red)
Use planning entities to improve the use of alternatives	3	(green)	14	(yellow)	14	(yellow)

Pathways and strategies	Reach		Sustain-ability		Spread	
	Relevant TAIs	Level of progress	Relevant activities	Level of Progress	Relevant activities	Level of progress
Washington juvenile indigent defense						
Training and technical assistance for juveniles' defense attorneys	2	🟡	8	🟡	7	🔴
Statewide policy change	1	🟡	4	🟢	0	N/A
Improving county juvenile court practices	2	🟡	3	🔴	3	🔴

Sources: Models for Change program documents, site visits, and key informant interviews.
Key: 🟢 Substantial progress; TAIs had extensive reach, on average; or at least 67% of activities were sustained or spread
         🟡 Moderate progress; TAIs had medium reach, on average; or 34 to 66% of activities were sustained or spread
         🔴 Limited or slower progress; TAIs had low reach, on average; or 33% or fewer activities were sustained or spread
N/A = not applicable

- **Forging links between state and local juvenile justice systems.** Reforms more often were spread and sustained when state and local stakeholders interacted frequently and deliberately to share information across levels of government. State officials acquired knowledge about innovations from county systems, and county staff better understood and implemented state policies. For example, the two most populous counties in Pennsylvania, Philadelphia and Allegheny, came together in the aftercare pathway, recognized a common problem, and sought a solution that would be effective in both counties. Their common problem was that many youth who returned to school after incarceration soon dropped out. In exploring the problem, the counties realized that Pennsylvania lacked a standard curriculum that would help residential programs and school districts reintegrate youth to school. That realization led the counties to begin discussions with the state Department of Education and various courts. State-county discussions eventually led to the creation of the Pennsylvania Academic and Career/Technical Training (PACTT) Alliance, which led to a set of projects to ease the transition of incarcerated youth back into their communities. The strong connections between the state and local juvenile justice systems helped reformers understand the ramifications of decisions at different levels of the system, facilitated coordination and the communication of ideas, and helped resolve differences.

- **Implementing multiple tactics to spur reform.** Effective Models for Change strategies used multiple tactics to address problems from different angles. Pennsylvania Models for Change used at least 11 tactics to address the complex problem of racial and ethnic disparities in the treatment of youth involved with the juvenile justice system. Some tactics helped reveal the existence of disproportionalities to key stakeholders; others helped counter unconscious biases in the system by designing and implementing value-neutral assessment tools.

- **Allocating resources for dissemination and replication.** Models for Change partners advanced reforms in part by focusing some of their efforts on purposefully diffusing the innovations and best practices that they implemented. Partners that allocated some funds to dissemination went on to develop implementation toolkits, provide training and capacity-

building, and use contracting processes to encourage innovation among contractors. For example, the Models for Change partners working on alternatives to formal processing and secure confinement in King County, Washington, obtained additional funding to show other counties how they could replicate the successful Pathnet model of dropout reengagement.

Guided by lead entity organizations, the Models for Change partners that made substantial progress toward juvenile justice reform through one or more pathways did several things well. First, they identified appropriate targeted areas for improvement, and implemented effective strategies and tactics. In addition, these partners supported, and in some senses amplified, their implementation through the effective use of data, multi-level collaboration, mutually reinforcing strategies and tactics, and proactive dissemination.

The experiences of the core states largely validated key assumptions in the Foundation's theory about how individual states could achieve juvenile justice reform. The analysis confirmed, for example, that two-way activities between state and local levels and adaptability on the part of Models for Change partners were vital to systems change. The states' experiences also upheld the Foundation's supposition that states can progress toward juvenile justice reform from a variety of starting points.

D. Action networks analysis

Judging from effectiveness scores that the evaluation team developed (see Chapter II), all three action networks achieved positive results with at least three-quarters of the activities they pursued. That is, the evaluation team had evidence that most activities were: associated with a change in practice or policy, well-received by stakeholders, replicated, sustained beyond an initial implementation period, or sustained with funding from sources other than Models for Change. This finding is strong affirmation of the action networks' overall success and effectiveness. But the scoring method is admittedly limiting; it equates the five components of the effectiveness score, masks exactly which components were achieved, and omits components that are arguably appropriate to consider—such as whether an activity was innovative, and whether activities were in the service of especially ambitious or complex goals. Thus, the evaluation relied on qualitative data to better understand each network's particular strengths and challenges and identify cross-cutting lessons.

1. Juvenile indigent defense

The juvenile indigent defense network had a narrower scope than the other two networks. It focused on a particular gap in the juvenile justice system, the provision of quality counsel to juveniles, as well as a particular player in the system, the juvenile defender. The latter feature may be viewed as a strength and a weakness of the network's approach. Because network teams were small and included mostly juvenile advocates tasked with organizing their own peers, the network avoided the snags that can arise in efforts to collaborate with other stakeholders or generate buy-in from parties with conflicting priorities. On the other hand, advocates in the network seemed to naturally gravitate to strategies that played to their own strengths—legislative and judicial advocacy and strengthening the resources available to the juvenile defender community. A less insular network might have been a more innovative network and, thus, better at overcoming challenges.

Illustrating this point, several respondents interviewed for the evaluation said it was difficult to convince stakeholders to devote more resources to the improvement of juvenile defense. To be fair, the network was in operation during an economic recession, when states were loath to make substantial new investments of any kind. However, even smaller structural changes required redistribution of resources, and many respondents noted that convincing lawmakers to redirect money toward juveniles was difficult. For this reason, the network prioritized legislative and judicial changes that were less expensive to adopt and maintain (such as reducing shackling).

Juvenile defenders' own vested interests also arose as a stumbling block to the greater good of high-quality juvenile defense. Some defenders responded negatively to teams' attempts to increase the scope of the defender's role through standards or other guidelines lest it increase their workloads.

2. Disproportionate minority contact

Compared to the juvenile indigent defense network, the network on disproportionate minority contact used a wider range of strategies and engaged a wider range of stakeholders, including community members. Network teams received intensive technical assistance to support their implementation of their selected strategies, chose evidence-based products to use in their sites, and approached reforms with the backing of their communities, helping their efforts to gain traction and achieve measurable change in juvenile outcomes.

An unavoidable challenge that confronted the network's member sites was the sensitivity of the topic of disproportionate minority contact and the need to address it directly. Members noted that the network's coordinating organization adeptly made finger pointing off-limits. Nonetheless, respondents noted that several key players in their sites were not ready to engage in a productive conversation about the over-representation of youth of color in the system. Attempts to engage people in the conversation were sometimes futile; respondents in a few sites as well as the network coordinator described encountering hostile and/or defensive attitudes. Respondents worked to address this challenge by focusing conversations on issues related to increasing equality in the juvenile justice system as opposed to working to eliminate racial bias.

3. Mental health-juvenile justice

The mental health-juvenile justice network successfully piloted and spread several refined approaches to increasing the capacity of the juvenile justice system to identify mental illness in youth. Strategies targeted front-end diversion, workforce development, and family involvement.

The network was structured in such a way that all the states in a given strategic innovation group (SIG) were expected to use similar approaches to reform. Again, this approach was a strength and a weakness of the network. On one hand, when sites met to share their experiences, the fact that they were largely implementing similar curricula or interventions made it easy for participants to learn from one another, and to discuss their common challenges and pitfalls with a shared vocabulary. On the other hand, some efforts had less traction or success in some states than in others, and might have benefited from customization for local contexts.

Sustainability of funding was a problem for two programs in Illinois and one in Louisiana that were begun through the action network. The interventions may have been too labor- and resource- intensive to be integrated into existing budgets, and the states may not have sufficiently planned for long-term sustainability during implementation. For example, staff at correctional

facilities in one state were resistant to mental health screening. A network member speculated that the staff wanted to treat youth, but were aware of the budget implications of screening. If adolescents were screened and found to have mental illness, then staff would be required to provide services, and more services mean more costs. Such reluctance was compounded by the lack of action on the part of the network or the specific states to reframe the problem or to add resources to address it.

4. Cross-network findings

Although the strategies that were most effective for each network varied by network, two clear commonalities emerged: the networks progressed toward systems reform through (1) the use of training, and (2) the development and dissemination of standardized tools. The learning community approach seemed to provide a particularly conducive environment through which to apply these strategies to systems reform, possibly because of the availability of a large cross-section of jurisdictions to provide input into the gaps in practice and guidance for the system's workforce; the availability of a wealth of knowledge from coordinating organizations and the National Resource Bank; and a large sample of jurisdictions in which to test the quality of best practices, curricula, or training programs.

Training for systems staff. Although the strategies used within and across the action networks varied, the strategies that participants viewed as most successful were those that aimed to create change at the local level with people directly engaged in the work. What became clear to sites is that direct service providers needed training. All three networks used training (largely in-person) to meet their goals. The targets of the trainings varied from law enforcement officials to school officials who work with students with mental health needs to lawyers who represent youth to agency staff.

Development and dissemination of standardized tools and resources. All three networks helped their sites develop and share key resources and tools that they could use to shape practices and programs. The diversity of the sites and the types of partners contributing to the development of these tools demonstrated the need to adapt resources to local contexts. The ability to adapt resources that other sites used successfully helped best practices spread rapidly among members of the network. Guidance from the coordinating organizations and the National Resource Bank experts was also valuable to site teams that usually had limited access to a national or evidence-based perspective.

Across the networks, sites reported that states, local jurisdictions, and other entities outside their networks showed great interest in their products and in the cross-site products produced collaboratively (for example, the National Juvenile Defense Standards by the juvenile indigent defense network). Many respondents mentioned that other states requested ad hoc technical assistance, that they presented their work at national conferences, and that they were invited to speak to stakeholders in other states to share their lessons learned. The coordinating organizations of all three networks encouraged their sites to disseminate lessons and share their work with other jurisdictions, using the coordinators' own connections when possible and sharing results with the wider public.

5. Lessons about action network effectiveness

The analysis showed that, overall, the action networks were a highly valued experience. Respondents felt that the investment they made in the networks through their participation was worthwhile, and all agreed that they would participate in a similar endeavor if given a future opportunity. Many respondents said that participating in a network was one of the most interesting and rewarding experiences of their careers. The following factors were associated with network effectiveness, based on our analysis:

Prioritization of objectives and strategies. Having fewer or narrower objectives for the networks as a whole and for strategic topics may enable action network participants to be more focused and develop more effective solutions. Our analysis suggests that the juvenile indigent defense network's narrower focus (just two SIG topics) allowed the member states to collaborate on effective solutions while pursuing their own state-specific goals. Sites in the disproportionate minority contact network attempted to address a larger range of issues. They may have been unable to pursue all of them effectively because attention, time, and other resources were spread more thinly.

Freedom to customize solutions to fit local contexts. When network members have more flexibility to choose the approaches that suit their context best, it may increase the likelihood that successful initiatives are sustained. Even within a narrower focus, flexibility for states and sites to choose the programs and approaches that are best suited to their specific context may be an important factor in effectiveness. States in the mental health-juvenile justice network were asked to implement the same curricula or training using the same processes, and the results of these efforts were mixed in terms of traction and acceptability.

Due attention to structural aspects of systems reform. The disproportionate minority contact network focused on improving the capacity of its sites to target and design reforms, which seemed to contribute to the effectiveness of sites' efforts. The network encouraged the formation of governing committees with broad representation that included community members, which provided the grounding perspective of families and youth who are directly impacted by reforms. Sites in the network were also required to collect data on disproportionate minority contact to help target reform more effectively. Sites reported that their engagement with the data and the results of that process forever changed how they approach policy reform.

Integration of network activities into existing institutions. An existing institution can provide insurance against the inevitable turnover of human resources, provide access to institutional sources of funding, and act as a central point of convening for different parties interested in the same issues. Several juvenile indigent defense teams were able to embed themselves in organizations that were well recognized in the juvenile justice system, which gave their efforts longevity and credibility with other stakeholders. When teams are more widely spread across agencies and institutions, they may be more vulnerable to changes in priorities and less consistent in their messages.

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS

As the MacArthur Foundation concludes its juvenile justice programming and embarks on new program priorities, the findings from the retrospective evaluation of Models for Change offers several insights, as well as validations and refinements of the theories that guided the initiative.

A. Insights from the national context analysis

By design, the Foundation launched Models for Change at a propitious time in U.S. history for juvenile justice reform. Indeed, Foundation-sponsored research from the mid to late 1990s on adolescent brain development helped create the favorable reform climate that characterized the early 2000s. In addition to timing the initiative strategically, the Foundation gave the core states freedom to choose their targeted areas for improvement, and some of the TAIs that states selected already had salience and traction with juvenile justice experts, some national and state stakeholders, and youth advocates. Through its focus on state-selected TAIs and disproportionate minority contact, Models for Change was intended to facilitate and accelerate nascent reform efforts, and to generate lessons, research, models, and tools to support reform efforts across the nation.

The national context analysis component of the evaluation validated the Foundation's recognition and foresight that it faced a historic opportunity to act. Policymakers, the media, and the public were ready to reconsider what had become a harsh and punitive approach to juvenile justice and, because of the Foundation, sound evidence was available to illuminate problems and point society in the new direction it desired.

As the Foundation anticipated would happen over a decade-long initiative, contextual changes affected the pace and focus of reform. The national recession that began in 2008, for example, led to drastic budgetary belt-tightening by states. One result was that some states became more willing to use community-based alternatives to more costly formal processing and confinement. In these instances, fiscal concerns gave states the impetus to ask *Now what?* Models for Change responded by giving states research-based tools and techniques to implement effective, developmentally appropriate reforms.

The analysis's exploration of the alignment of the Models for Change TAIs with national and state-level priority areas showed that many states outside the initiative not only came to focus on the Models for Change TAIs, but they often pursued reforms through strategies that were also being used in Models for Change. This level of alignment was fostered by the MacArthur Foundation's intentional communication and dissemination efforts.

B. The complementary strategies of Models for Change

1. Conclusions about the core state strategy

This report has examined several of many possible cross-sections of Models for Change. It has summarized findings about the thousands of "progress events" reported by grantees. It has presented key findings about systems reform by state, by TAIs and SOTAs, and by whether activities were conducted as part of the initiative's core state or action network strategy. It has

analyzed key external factors that have affected the initiative' implementation. Each cross-sectional view of Models for Change requires one or more caveats about interpreting the results appropriately: association is not causation; dissimilar strategies are not fairly compared; systems change does not play out in controlled, laboratory-like conditions; states at different starting points cannot be expected to cross the finish line together; some social problems are less tractable than others, and so forth. When Models for Change is viewed retrospectively and as a whole, however, it is easier to see the initiative's defining achievement.

Models for Change profoundly altered the discourse about juvenile justice in the core states. Clearly, this is not the initiative's only achievement. It is arguably its *defining* achievement because altering the discourse was a necessary condition for progress in every core state; that is, without elevating and altering the discourse many of the ensuing achievements described in Chapter III would not have been possible or would not have been acceptable to stakeholders accustomed to previous practices. Because of Models for Change, more types of people were thinking, speaking, and writing about juvenile justice reform over a sustained period. More types of people were working together to develop and implement new practices and to change policies. Their thoughts, words, and actions reflected the MacArthur Foundation's guiding principles and imbued local culture. This evaluation showed that every core state can point to ways their juvenile justices systems were reconfigured or tooled up to be more fair, developmentally appropriate, and attentive to the needs of individual youth and families. Moreover, the quantity of sustained activities (see Table III.1, for example) is an important indicator of states' overall success; sustained activities were viewed by stakeholders as sufficiently valuable to warrant continuation.

To be sure, Models for Change was not responsible for the falling juvenile crime rates and budgetary belt-tightening that prompted many states to reconsider their need for large and costly juvenile correctional institutions. If crime rates had not dropped and the Great Recession not occurred, those institutions might be as fully occupied as ever. But crime rates and budgets did decline and create an opportunity for change. Together, the MacArthur Foundation's earlier research on adolescent brain development and Models for Change enabled the four core states to consider, believe in, and introduce or accelerate reforms. Interview data collected for the retrospective evaluation and Bennett-Midland data on grant goals and activities clearly show that Models for Change infused the core states with support for communications and technical assistance. Out came written products, professional conferences, tools, and trainings that both reflected and contributed to the change in discourse and culture. Interview respondents spoke very positively about these developments and, without exception, directly attributed them to Models for Change.

Respondents in the core states were least satisfied with progress in the area of disproportionate minority contact. States and localities that have high-quality data with which to monitor disparity know that it persists, mostly at pre-Models for Change levels. At the same time, respondents credit Models for Change with helping states and localities produce the data needed to understand and communicate problems of disparity to stakeholders; in this way, the initiative has informed the discourse about a topic with many intertwined causes.

Finally, respondents expressed concerns that many aspects of systems reform progress are reversible. Many of those who experienced Models for Change are firmly committed to its

ideals, but it remains to be seen whether incoming law enforcement officers, judges, probation officers, defense attorneys, elected officials and staffers will assimilate to the culture that Models for Change helped to shape.

2.   Conclusions about the action network strategy

The action network analysis examined implicit assumptions about the suitability of learning communities to influencing social change. One such assumption is that learning communities can function as effective one-room schoolhouses. Another is that learning community participants will be able to function as agents of change in their home communities.

Mutual benefits despite disparate backgrounds. In learning communities that function as effective one-room schoolhouses, participants of all experience levels can make individual progress and mutually benefit. In contrast, a potential pitfall of learning communities is lopsided benefit, in which less experienced participants benefit more from interacting with more experienced peers than vice versa. In the case of Models for Change, one might assume that the core states would mentor the partner states in the networks and learn or benefit relatively little themselves. In fact, the analysis did *not* find evidence of such lopsided benefits. The coordinating organizations for each network seemed to help the networks avoid that pitfall.

To begin, the coordinating organization for each network was explicitly charged with facilitating progress across all of the sites in the network (in addition to helping to select sites and setting the tone and vision for the network). One strategy they used to promote progress among all sites was to match sites based on challenges in common and then encourage and facilitate communication to address those challenges. A second strategy was to provide all sites with the same framework to guide whatever work was at hand, and to then allow sites to independently design their innovations according to their own understanding of the circumstances within their regions. Respondents in the disproportionate minority contact and juvenile indigent defense networks said this flexibility enabled sites to adapt their innovations appropriately and respond better to the needs of their stakeholders. Thus, all sites made progress from a variety of starting points and levels of experience with an issue.

Network participants as change agents. A second critical assumption about learning communities is that participants will be able to function as agents of change in their home communities and will have opportunities to *apply* their learning. In other words, action network participants would not only take learning and tools from the network, but also share it with peers and stakeholders in their communities and persuade them to act or change behavior in some way. Indeed, sites across the networks commonly said they struggled to obtain buy-in from system players that weren't involved in the networks. The intransigence that sites encountered stemmed from reluctance to admit to problems or to do the added work that reform would require.

Action network participants cited two factors that helped them meet the challenge of motivating change in their sites. First was the imprimatur of the MacArthur Foundation's support of their work. The Foundation's reputation and credibility was vital in helping teams bring other key stakeholders to the table, and getting the right people to listen. Second were the cross-network meetings. All sites described the meetings as valuable opportunities to connect with stakeholders with different perspectives on a given issue. The participants felt that the topics addressed by each network were interrelated, and the cross-network meetings gave them a

chance to see how the policies and changes they sought might affect juveniles and jurisdictions in other ways. For example, defenders in the juvenile indigent defense action network were able to sit down with probation officials in the disproportionate minority contact network to discuss post-disposition issues. They left the meeting with a deeper understanding of the concerns of probation in how juveniles are treated after their disposition, but also with personal connections to probation officials whom they could call upon in the future.

3.   Relative benefits of the core state and action network strategies

The core state and action network strategies amounted to a well-rounded initiative of complementary strategies, as the Foundation intended. By making sizeable, long-term investment in the core states, and providing technical assistance and other learning opportunities, the Foundation intended to foster comprehensive systems change in the those states. In addition to the core states, Models for Change involved partner states in action networks. In contrast to the core state strategy, the action networks were more issue-focused and intended to foster the development and sharing of knowledge, skills, and strategies among peers. Overall, four states participated in both the core state and action network strategies and 12 others participated in only action networks. (No states participated in only the core strategy.) This section identifies the relative benefits of these two Models for Change strategies.

Generous funding and time were strengths of the core state strategy. Core states were involved in Models for Change for a 6- to 10-year period, including time to identify root causes of system dysfunction; develop a theory of change; and plan, implement, or continue reform activities. The amount of time granted to core states also meant they would have the opportunity to see reform activities play out and affect other system components *and* address repercussions as needed. In Pennsylvania, for example, growth in the use of mental health screening and evidence-based treatment practices involved families in the provision of services to youth offenders to a greater degree than before their introduction. As a result, Pennsylvania Models for Change unexpectedly realized it would have to develop guidelines and policies for the increased role of parents in the juvenile justice system. The core state strategy, as the Foundation envisioned it, made time and funding available for states to act and adapt as needed in the face of such realizations.

By contrast, a common concern expressed by action network respondents interviewed for the evaluation was the relatively short period that the network was active (three to four years) and the high expectations they had for achieving results within that window. Many sites did not join a network with a predefined plan for how to carry out their goals, so they spent considerable time and effort in the planning process or in adjusting general strategies to suit their specific environments. With additional time, sites felt they could have made deeper impact or conducted more advocacy related to the changes they sought.

States that participated only in action networks received funding to support their participation, but unlike the core states they were not funded to accomplish systems change. Many action network respondents mentioned the challenge of convincing stakeholders to devote more resources toward the juvenile justice system. The state teams working toward state funding of better juvenile defense had a particularly challenging time because of the large investment it would require at a time of economic recession. However, even smaller structural changes required redistribution of resources, and many respondents noted that convincing lawmakers to

redirect money toward juveniles was difficult. For this reason, participants in the juvenile defense action network kept their ambitions in check. In contrast, although the core states also had to adapt to changing circumstances during the course of Models for Change, the dedicated funding they received for systems change helped make the core states more resilient to contextual change that could otherwise have threatened progress.

Collaboration and reduced isolation were benefits of the action network strategy. All three action networks encouraged the formation of strong partnerships across stakeholders *within a site*; many of these partnerships continued to collaborate and change policy even after the networks ended. Many respondents noted that, without the network, they would not have been able to form the close relationships with other stakeholders in the juvenile justice system that enabled them to succeed. The existence of the network and the reputation of the Foundation provided motivation for key players *within a site* to work together and reach consensus on important issues.

All three networks also encouraged collaboration *among* sites. One original goal of creating the action networks was to enable disparate states to work together to address a policy issue and, through that collaboration and shared experience, help states learn from one another. Collaboration among sites happened in both formal and informal ways, including ad hoc and planned meetings, conferences, and visits to other network sites, and was fostered by the collegial relationships participants developed over time.

One of the often-mentioned benefits of being part of a network was hearing how other states and localities have addressed concerns in their jurisdictions. The networks provided sites with different perspectives and ideas on how their system might work differently with changes in policy or practice. Respondents agreed that the connections made through the networks would not have been made otherwise, and certainly would not have been used to the extent that they were. Because team members had the opportunity to work closely with peers in other states, they developed an appreciation for the work done in other places and were more willing to try those approaches in their own jurisdictions.

A few respondents noted that, before joining the network, they felt isolated in terms of their challenges and believed that they had to bring about change on their own. Participating in the network gave them a sense of not being alone in their struggle and demonstrated ways that they could find support for their work outside of and within their state. The networks brought together stakeholders within a state to work on issues that were of common interest. For example, one site brought key policy influencers at the state level to the same team; that team collaborated on writing legislation and passing it into law in a way that would have been difficult if the network had not brought the team together.

The core states came to appreciate the complementary benefits of the two Models for Change strategies over time. The core states were initially reluctant action network participants. Across all three networks, respondents found the partner sites to be, at first, more enthusiastic than core states about participating in network activities. All partner sites had been invited to join the network through a selective process and were identified by their desire to make policy change in the particular focal area of the network or previous track record in that area. As noted, they were also provided with funding to aid in allocating time and resources to

the effort. The core sites, on the other hand, were essentially part of the action networks by default of their involvement in Models for Change and were not compensated specifically for their work in the networks. Moreover, the core sites were also already working on reforms as part of the Models for Change in areas that were not necessarily a focus of the networks.

In both the mental health-juvenile justice and juvenile indigent defense networks, respondents felt that the four core states were initially slow in their implementation of network activities, but that eventually they caught up to the partner states and remained engaged with a comparable level of enthusiasm through the end of the networks. In the disproportionate minority contact network, some of the core states were unwilling to work on issues of race from within the network, and essentially found ways to divert their resources elsewhere. The sites in Louisiana and Washington in particular were reluctant to participate in the network. In contrast, Berks County, Pennsylvania, showed some success in reducing disparities as part of its work in the network. Most sites in the disproportionate minority contact network, both core and partner, did participate successfully, but the network had more sites that resisted completely (about 20 percent of the original sites) than other networks.

Unexpectedly, the cross-network meetings, at which members of the three Models for Change networks met, proved especially useful for the core states. The meetings allowed each state team to connect with people in other capacities in their own states whom they could call upon when they had questions about how changes in juvenile defense, for instance, might affect the mental health system. This is an example of the action networks eventually proving their usefulness to the core states, in this case by reducing the isolation of people working in a particular youth services sector.

C. Practical lessons about creating systems change

This report concludes with practical insights from key interview respondents about which strategies and tactics that characterized the Models for Change approach worked especially well in the core states, and what Models for Change might have done better.

What Models for Change did especially well

- **Provided leadership and vision, and let states set their own agendas.** Models for Change did this by:

    - Funding the research that established that "kids are different" from adults, bringing that knowledge to state and local juvenile justice systems, and embarking on a collective discovery about how to change those systems. A respondent said, "That kind of message-carrying went from the national to the local level, certainly in the [core] states and in the locations where the action networks were important. That's big stuff and it was done better than anyone else has done it before."

    - Putting forth a vision for systems reform that was palatable and balanced. It was not "overly liberal" or "overly conservative," and it was expressed "in terms of public safety and better outcomes for kids and families."

    - Letting states develop their own strategic directions and work plans. This approach "made all the difference in the world" and "expedited reform" because states involved the people and organizations and pursued activities as they saw fit.

- Being more willing, relative to other foundations in the juvenile justice space, to let reform evolve in the core states and for states to modify their strategies accordingly. In this way, Models for Change was conducive to innovation.

- **Created awareness of problems and the desire to improve.** Models for Change did this by:

  - Shining a national spotlight on problematic state issues. When Illinois's drug transfer laws were highlighted for federal authorities, those authorities said, "Illinois, you are out of step," which "really transformed" attitudes in the state. A respondent said that the "power of Models for Change" was being willing and able to seed that transformation.

  - Sending MacArthur Foundation leadership to meet with juvenile justice leadership in the core states, thus generating "buy-in from the top into the whole [initiative]." "They did that well."

  - Driving more and better collection and use of data, especially by stakeholders with little or no prior interest or experience in using data to identify and understand problems, identify the characteristics of target populations, or monitor progress. Describing the most successful aspects of Models for Change in Louisiana, a respondent said, "Data was being collected. It was being used more. …From probation to judges to local advocates—everybody was paying more attention to the data that was available, or they were trying to make sure it was becoming available. That would be another big [Models for Change] accomplishment."

- **Created and supported communities of learners and doers.** Models for Change did this by:

  - Providing technical expertise based on research about adolescent brain development in Louisiana, which was just embarking on its reform journey when it joined Models for Change. A respondent said, "You can hear the difference in the way we talk." We now cite research that says "when you detain a kid you're not doing them a favor."

  - Equipping states with "the set of specialists or experts to help advance the work" of systems change. "Usually foundations just give you money and say 'Do it.'"

  - Hosting national conferences that are valuable in two ways: for the quality of the presentations, and for the opportunity to network with national experts. A Pennsylvania respondent said the Cross Action Network meetings are "the most useful meetings [she] attends in a year" because they keep her up to date with the work of peers in other states.

  - Helping reformers develop enduring professional networks. A respondent said that having relationships that begin in the individual action networks and carry through to annual convenings "makes a huge difference in how we look at our practice, and what we think about, and what we think of as possible."

  - Providing sufficient funding for state and local stakeholder engagement. Models for Change allowed states to convene the right people with the right frequency and make the interaction worth everyone's while. A respondent said, "There's a great deal of value in all of us coming together and knowing what everybody's doing, what they're looking at, and how we can all support it or fit it into our initiatives."

- Fostering the professional development of local leaders into state and national leaders, thereby imbuing juvenile justice systems at all levels with the Models for Change ethos.

What Models for Change might have done better

- **Shown a greater appreciation for state-specific contexts.** Models for Change might have done this better by:

  - Coaching some National Resource Bank experts so that they would not behave like "parachute-in consultants," who provided advice to core states without regard for whether and how it could actually be implemented in a specific state or local context.

- **Recognized and acted on certain strategic opportunities to facilitate change.** Models for Change might have done this better by:

  - Being more inclusive initially of district attorneys and law enforcement. A Louisiana respondent said, "Even when we would bring our DAs and law enforcement to national meetings and convenings, they usually left more frustrated than helped, because they didn't feel they had a voice in Models for Change outside of Louisiana."

  - Viewing juvenile justice systems as inclusive of *all* entities that could help prevent system involvement in the first place or keep youth from returning to the system. "At the beginning, the actual, or at least perceived, message was that working with the schools was actually not a part of Models for Change. It was for kids who were already in the system; there were other groups that were working on the school to prison pipeline, for example." The respondent who made this observation credited the MacArthur Foundation with eventually widening its view of what Models for Change might fund regarding pre- and post-system involvement. "With experience, we have all evolved and changed."

  - Taking steps to ensure that the body of MacArthur Foundation-funded research on adolescent brain development gets incorporated into the curricula of Administration of Justice higher-education programs. A respondent who was pleased that juvenile justice professionals in his state had absorbed messages about adolescent brain development worried that *students* of juvenile justice are not being exposed to the same information. "I still see kids who want to be cops going to both community colleges and four-year institutions in an AJ curriculum and carrying both the attitude and getting the feedback that, ʿYou're a cop.ʾ And I think that's the biggest thing we're missing right now. We're getting into all kinds of professional places with people … but I just think there's a muddy hill to slide down if that [matter of educating the next generation] isn't approached."

- **Advanced a more rigorous research and evaluation agenda, as well as a flexible learning agenda.** In addition to preparing for and funding a retrospective evaluation of Models for Change, the Foundation might have yielded better evidence of the effectiveness of specific interventions *and* maintained a flexible evaluation framework by:

  - Encouraging the core states to develop and pursue evaluation plans to meet their own learning objectives. A Washington respondent said it would have been better to build

evaluation into Models for Change plans from the start, "rather than trying to piece all this together at the end." He also noted that some local sites in Washington included evaluation plans in their Models for Change grant proposals and were told by the Foundation not to pursue those plans because the Foundation would take care of evaluation.

- Supporting more peer-reviewed evaluation research. A respondent said it was a "huge flaw" of Models for Change to fund the participation of a great number of Louisiana law enforcement officers on the Crisis Intervention Training for Youth, the CITY mental health curriculum, and not conduct a "real evaluation to say the impact of it." As a result, "You've got products out there and if they haven't been evaluated, they are not in the literature. They are not outside the mindset of MacArthur and what they have supported. There is nothing in the peer-reviewed literature that says these models, these products, these deliverables are good and they are sustainable." Without such evidence, law enforcement agencies will not say, ''Hey, I want to see this CITY thing.'"

- Setting more consistent expectations about what the core states were supposed to measure. Key respondents from a lead entity said the MacArthur Foundation framed Models for Change to the core states as a "catalytic intervention." He continued, "If you start out to be a catalyst then what you're really measuring is the rate of change and the nature of change as a result of your catalytic intervention. The foundation started there, but wanted to be more." Lead entities, at least those in the first states to join Models for Change, were confused and felt blind-sided by the Foundation's eventual and then repeated requests for individual-level outcomes for youth. Although the Foundation understood systems change would not be linear, a respondent said, "At the same time they could never figure out what exactly their theory of evaluation and change was so that you measure."

- Appreciating the art in systems change as much as the science. As a Pennsylvania respondent described his state's experience, "If you are really a catalyst, you don't know what the formula will look like after you've added whatever ingredients to the mix. Then you have to be responsive to what you've created and then move to the next level. I think the Foundation thought it was much more like a different kind of lab test. You could start on this date and then you'll produce X and that will lead to Y very clearly. I think [that expectation] changed over time when they realized some successes, like PACTT, that weren't in the work plans.

Models for Change was conceived by the MacArthur Foundation and then evolved over a decade, shaped by the Foundation, the National Resource Bank, the core states, and the action network partner states and localities. All these participants abided a set of guiding principles about a fairer, more effective, and more developmentally appropriate juvenile justice system. Crucially, they also took the position that reforming a system begins with changing how people in the system think, behave, and work together. They recognized that systems change requires culture change. Culture change is slow and steady at best; more typically it alternates between progress and setbacks. The time and resources that the key Models for Change participants devoted to culture change paid off when stakeholders throughout state and local systems largely accepted—not rejected or ignored—the new practices, approaches, and tools that Models for Change produced. Models for Change has not given the juvenile justice field, or any socially

complex field, a simpler way to systems change. It has shown by countless examples that there are no shortcuts.

REFERENCES

Bradford, S., & Institute, J. P. (2013). *Common Ground: Lessons Learned from Five States that Reduced Juvenile Confinement by More Than Half*: Justice Policy Institute.

Brown, S. A. (2012). *Trends in Juvenile Justice State Legislation 2001-2011*: National Conference of State Legislatures.

Bryer, S., & Levin, M. (2013). *The Comeback States: Reducing Youth Incarceration in the United States* (pp. 54): National Juvenile Justice Network & Texas Public Policy Foundation.

Buck-Willison, J., Mears, D., & Butts, J. (2011). The U.S. Juvenile Justice Policy Landscape. In K. Ismaili (Ed.), *U.S. Criminal Justice Policy. A Contemporary Reader*. Sudbury, MA: Jones and Bartlett.

Daugherty, C. E. (2013). *State Trends: Legislative Victories from 2011–2013 Removing Youth from the Adult Criminal Justice System*: Washington, DC: Campaign for Youth Justice.

Fromknecht, A. (2014). Systems Integration: Child Welfare and Junvenile Justice *JJGPS StateScan*. Pittsburgh, PA: National Center for Juvenile Justice.

Greenwood, P., Welsh, B., & Rocque, M. (2012). *Implementing Proven Programs for Juvenile Offenders: Assessing State Progress*. Downington, PA: Association for the Advancement of Evidence-Based Practice.

National Research Council. (2013). *Reforming Juvenile Justice: A Developmental Approach*. In R. J. B. Committee on Assessing Juvenile Justice Reform, Robert L. Johnson, Betty M. Chemers, and Julie A. Schuck, (Ed.) Committee on Law and Justice, Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education (Ed.). Washington, D.C.: National Academies Press.

Phillippi, S., & Arteaga, P. "Louisiana Juvenile Justice System Provider Survey Findings: Results from the 2011 Self-Report Survey Including Trend Analyses from 2007 and 2009 Surveys." December 2011.

Sattar, Samina, Megan Hague-Angus, and Beth Stevens. "The Action Networks Component of Models for Change." Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research, May 14, 2015.

Sedlak, A. J., & McPherson, K. S. (2010). Youth's needs and services: Findings from the survey of youth in residential placement *OJJDP Juvenile Justice Bulletin* (pp. 10-11): U.S. Department of Justice; Office of Justice Programs; Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Siegel, G., & Lord, R. "When Systems Collide: Improving Court Practices and Programs in Dual Jurisdiction Programs." OJJDP Technical Assistance to the Juvenile Court Special Project Bulletin, June 2004.

Seigle, E., & Walsh, N. (2014). *Core Principles for Reducing Recidivism and Improving Other Outcomes for Youth in the Juvenile Justice System*. New York: Council of State Governments Justice Center.

Stein, Jilian, Douglas Young, and Beth Stevens (2015). "Models for Change: National Context for Reforms." Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research, February 17, 2015.

Stevens, Beth, Samina Sattar et al. (2015). Models for Change Cross-State Report. Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research, May 14, 2015.

TeamChild. "Yakima Demonstration Project: Initial Appearance Representation". Available at [http://www.teamchild.org/index.php/projects/56/ima].

Zimring, F.E. (1998). A youth violence epidemic: Myth or reality? In F.E. Zimring (Ed.), American Youth Violence (pp. 31-48). New York: Oxford University Press.

APPENDIX A

GLOSSARY OF KEY TERMS

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

Glossary of Models for Change terms

Purpose of the Glossary. This document sets out definitions of terms that are frequently used by both the Foundation's Models for Change and the Mathematica evaluation team. It is intended to standardize the definitions of the major terms so references to these terms in reports are based on the same concepts. The terms are listed in alphabetical order. To avoid missing a key term, we have included a range of terms that might possibly be defined in different ways by different participants. Many of these definitions come from internal Foundation documents, including "Juvenile Justice Grant-making Strategy" (MacArthur 2004) and "Models for Change: Building Momentum for Juvenile Justice Reform" (MacArthur 2006).

Accountability. Acknowledgment and willingness to assume responsibility for actions, decisions, and policies.

Activity. Specific actions taken by Models for Change participants to generate changes. Examples of activities include: testifying before a legislative committee, instituting training in new procedures for juvenile justice professionals, or producing a tool kit.

Action Networks. Created under Models for Change, the Action Networks are learning communities in which a collaborative of states, and sometimes localities, would work together to develop targeted projects that addressed a key issue within one of three crucial topics: (1) disproportionate minority contact, (2) the integration of mental health into juvenile justice processes, and (3) juvenile indigent defense.

Adolescent development. There are fundamental biological and behavioral differences between adolescents and adults. Adolescence is a developmental period characterized by susceptibility to peer influence, risk taking, lack of future orientation, and impulsivity. These characteristics make it more likely that adolescents will make choices that involve them in some type of delinquent behavior, but they do not meet the standards for adult criminal responsibility and their behavior does not warrant criminal sanctions.

Adultified. Culture of holding juveniles to standards for adults or of processing juveniles in adult criminal courts. See also **Adolescent development.**

Aftercare. Targeted area of improvement that focuses on services supporting re-entry into the community to youth who have been incarcerated in out-of-home facilities.

Alternatives to Formal Processing (ATFP). Targeted area of improvement which focuses on reducing secure confinement, including detention and incarceration, in favor of alternative placements.

Champions of reform. Individuals that help to build a broader constituency for systems change, to create and sustain momentum, and promote accountability for the outcomes (also known as change agents).

Characteristic. The distinguishing features, attributes, or trait of a juvenile justice system, an individual youth, a community, or a state that makes them different from others.

Community-Based Resources (CBR). Targeted area of improvement designed to expand the resources available to counties to improve their juvenile justice systems, build up the capacity of counties to implement reform, improve coordination with institutions that feed juveniles into the system, and improve services for sub-populations of youth offenders.

Complex interventions. A complex intervention is an intervention is a system that is highly unpredictable and non-linear because the goals and strategies are numerous and change over time. As the multiple strategies are implemented, they set off responses that generate new dynamics that cannot be predicted.

Complicated interventions. Complicated interventions are interventions with a large number of decisions and steps to implement. The launch of a spacecraft is one example; while numerous and intricate, such processes have a focused goal and steps are directly related to that goal.

Constituencies for juvenile justice reform. The group of individuals that make up the system, influence aspects of the system, or are impacted by the system. They include both traditional and non-traditional groups:

- **Traditional***: (1) law enforcement, (2) judiciary and the juvenile court, (3) probation and any local juvenile justice agency, (4) state attorney's office (prosecutors), (5) public defender's office and defense bar, (6) juvenile corrections and any state juvenile justice agency, (7) child welfare, (8) mental health services, (9) substance abuse services, (10) public health, (11) education (including special and alternative education), (12) employment and training, (13) other institutions, such as detention, other social service agencies, and (14) victims.

- **Non-traditional** ("outside the system"): (1) advocates and advocacy organizations, (2) other community-based organizations (including youth development and civil rights groups), (3) clergy, (4) professional membership organizations, (5) universities, (6) community residents, parents, and youth.

Core State Strategy. A multifaceted model of comprehensive systems change in four states (Illinois, Louisiana, Pennsylvania, and Washington) that was designed to support the development and spread of innovation at the state and local levels as a part of the MacArthur Foundation's Models for Change Initiative.

Core values. Values that form the basis on which an organization performs its work and conducts itself; principles that guide an organization's internal conduct and relationships with other organizations. See also Principles.

Decision points. Points or stages in juvenile case processing where the extent of a youth's further involvement in the system is determined, and they are either diverted from the pipeline or continue to penetrate deeper into the system. For example: arrest, referral to court, detention, and placement.

Delinquency petitions. The process for filing formal documents that describe the unlawful acts of juveniles. Youth are not charged with crimes, rather petitions of delinquency are filed against them.

Detention assessment instrument. A risk assessment tool intended to reduce inadvertent bias in the screening process for the decision to detain youth by introducing considerations about a youth's mental health in explaining her or his actions. The Detention Assessment Instrument (DAI) is a specific tool developed by Berks County, Pennsylvania.

Developmental framework for juvenile justice. Seeks to hold youths accountable for their unlawful behavior in ways that do not jeopardize their future life chances. From the perspective of this framework, it is important to (1) use scientific research on adolescent development to inform laws, policies, and practices; (2) focus on the individual offender to determine effective sanctions, treatment, and care; (3) use knowledge of adolescent development to enable decision makers to make rational and informed choices in the individual cases of juvenile offenders.

Developmental perspective on youth crime. A knowledge base that explains behavior less in terms of immutable defects in character, and more in terms of transient stages of adolescent immaturity and mutable environmental risk factors, such as the peer group pressure.

Disparity. A difference in outcomes, or in the probability of receiving a particular outcome. See also **Disproportionate Minority Contact**.

Disposition. Decision given to a juvenile adjudicated delinquent, rather than a conviction.

Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC). Targeted area of improvement that focused on efforts to successfully reduce over-representations of youth of color at key decision points in the juvenile justice system, as well as eliminate racial and ethnic disparities in system decision-making and reduce further system penetration by youth of color.

Diversion. Formal and informal approaches to diverting youth away from secure confinement, including detention and incarceration, into alternative and developmentally appropriate treatment and supervision environments. See also **Alternatives to Formal Processing.**

Effectiveness of a Pathway. The ability to trigger change in a targeted area by initiating, advancing, or accelerating reform.

Evidence-Based Practices. Targeted area of improvement that focuses on funding and implementing practices that have been shown to improve outcomes for youth and the juvenile justice system, including standardized assessment tools and screening protocols

Functional Family Therapy (FFT). A family-based prevention and intervention program for youth who have demonstrated the entire range of maladaptive, acting out behaviors and syndromes.

Goal. A goal is an aim or desired result. The primary goal of Models for Change is to promote a juvenile justice system that is linked to other agencies and organizations—a system that holds young offenders accountable for their actions, provides for their rehabilitation, protects them from harm, increases their life chances, and manages the risk they pose to themselves and to public safety. The desired result is the existence of court rules, regulations, policies, and statutes that are fair and effective, developmentally appropriate, and based on scientific research

evidence and knowledge of best practices that embody the underlying principles of a model system.

Harm reduction. The elimination of harsh and punitive sanctions or minimizing the harmful content of sanctions.

Implementation. The process of putting a plan, program, or policy into action.

Intervention point. A point at which a strategy is implemented or carried out in order to modify activities or relationships to generate change at the sub-system level. See also **Leverage point**.

Jurisdictional Boundaries (JB). Targeted area of improvement that focuses on promoting jurisdictional reforms to change the boundaries (for example, age limits) for juvenile justice services and judicial administration.

Juvenile incarceration. Secure confinement in a locked facility, a training school or youth prison.

Juvenile Indigent Defense (JID). Special focus area of reform that includes efforts to improving access to and use of properly trained juvenile defenders and defense services.

Juvenile intake officer. In some jurisdictions, the person who decides to proceed to file a delinquency petition against a youth. In other jurisdictions, the person responsible for referring or forwarding the case to the prosecutor for formal, legal petitioning.

Lead entity. The organization chosen by the Foundation to convene and coordinate the Models for Change work in a state.

Leverage point. A point of interaction of key elements at a specific site (either empirical or conceptual) to drive change. In Models for Change the term is used to refer to the targeted areas for improvement. See **Targeted Area for Improvement.**

Measures. The purpose of measures is to understand how an intervention has influenced or changed the processes, practices, behaviors, attitudes, knowledge or intentions of system constituencies over time. **Baseline measures** describe the state of the measures before any changes, improvements, or interventions were introduced, and are the basis against which change or progress can be measured. **Process measures** indicate whether the system is engaging in specific practices and whether certain activities were implemented. **Outcome measures** indicate whether the system is achieving desired objectives and are used to track progress toward reform goals across the targeted areas.

Milestone. An important event in a timeline; a significant stage or occurrence in a process.

Multisystemic Therapy (MST). An intensive, family-focused and community-based treatment program model for violence prevention in youth.

Out of home placement. The court-ordered residential placement of youth in training school, treatment center, boot camp, drug or mental health treatment facility, or group home.

Outcomes. The specific, concrete results expected from practices and policies engaged in by the system. See also **Vital Signs**.

Overrepresentation or disproportionate representation. A situation in which the proportion of a group at any of several stages of processing exceeds their proportion among the total processed before that stage. See also **Disproportionate Minority Contact**.

Pathway. A series of decisions taken and resulting events that form a relatively unified sequence of action. Such sequences can be traced by evaluators to understand attempts to generate changes in specific parts of a system.

Policies. Formal processes or rules that are used by public and private agencies and institutions to guide decisions and actions and achieve rational outcomes.

Practices. The ways in which (or means through which) treatment and other services are delivered.

Principle. Fundamental truth or proposition that serves as the foundation for a system of belief or behavior or for a chain of reasoning; a comprehensive and fundamental law, doctrine, or assumption. See also **Core values**. The core principles of Models for Change are:

- **Recognition of developmental differences**: Youth are inherently different from adults. (The system must take into account that juveniles are fundamentally and developmentally different from adults.)

- **Fundamental fairness**: Individuals who become involved in the system should be treated without bias, self-interest, or favoritism, particularly in regard to sex, race, and culture. (All system participants—including youthful offenders, their victims and their families—deserve bias-free treatment.)

- **Recognition of individual differences**: Youth differ from one another in their backgrounds and experiences, as well as needs, strengths, and abilities. (Juvenile justice decision makers must acknowledge and respond to individual differences in terms of young people's development, culture, gender, needs and strengths.)

- **Recognition of potential**: Youth are capable of rehabilitation and positive change in a way that benefits them and society as a whole.

- **Safety**: Communities and individuals deserve to be safe and to feel safe.

- **Personal responsibility**: Youth must be taught to be accountable for their own actions. (Young people must be encouraged to accept responsibility for their actions and the consequences of those actions.)

- **Community responsibility**: Communities have an obligation to safeguard the welfare of children and adolescents, to support them in need, and to help them grow into healthy and productive citizens.

- **System responsibility**: The juvenile justice system has an obligation to protect youth from harm and to promote their development. (The juvenile justice system is a vital part of society's collective exercise of its responsibility toward young people. It must do its job effectively.)

Promising practices. Juvenile justice programs and services that both research and expert opinion suggest can lead to improved system performance and outcomes.

Reach of an action or program. The size and range of potential change resulting from the implementation of an action or program.

Relative Rate Index (RRI). The standard measure of disproportionate minority contact used by the federal Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Relative Rate Index scores above 1.0 indicate a disproportionately high rate of contact between youth of color and the juvenile justice system, while a score below 1.0 means that youth of color has a lower rate of contact than white youth. The size of the RRI indicates the magnitude of difference between the two groups (e.g., an RRI of 2.0 means that there is twice the rate of contact).

Risk Assessment. In Models for Change, risk assessment refers to the use of objective and validated instruments to test youth offenders to measure whether they pose a risk of recidivism or threaten public safety.

Special Opportunities for Technical Assistance (SOTA). Related to targeted areas for improvement, the SOTAs are where activities were intended to concentrate on the provision of expertise rather than direct efforts to engender systems change.

Spread of a program or activity. An activity can be said to have spread if it has expanded into other locations or situations and resulted in a broadening of its contribution to system reform.

Stages of processing (in the juvenile justice system). Includes (1) arrest, (2) intake to the juvenile justice system, (3) pre-hearing detention, (4) petitioning and prosecution, (5) adjudication, and (6) case disposition, including commitment and placement.

Strategy. A careful plan or method for achieving a particular goal usually over a long period of time. For this evaluation, a strategy is a stream of activities within a pathway that targets a specific element of a targeted area of improvement. Strategies allow tracking the interaction among tactics and activities aimed at different objectives but the same overall goal.

Sustainability or sustained operations. An activity can be said to be sustained if it continued to exist or contribute to change after its initial implementation period.

Systems change. A multi-level approach to reform that assumes interrelated mechanisms and influences among individuals, families, communities, and jurisdictions. In the context of Models for Change, law enforcement and juvenile justice organizations (juvenile courts, probation services, operators of detention and secure placement facilities) work with other systems (education, mental health, public health, and child welfare) at the local and state levels to create a greater whole – the overall juvenile justice system. Systems change emerges and spreads through the interactions of the states' lead entities (grantees), the local demonstration sites, and the individuals (youth) served in those sites.

Tactic. The actions that carry out strategies as part of a pathway (see **Pathway**). For example, Models for Change tactics include:

- **Policy research:** defining the problem, inventorying existing resources, and reviewing current practices;

- **Collaborative planning and infrastructure development**: creation of taskforces or other institutions to offer neutral discussion spaces and to enable joint decision-making among separate agencies and organizations; and

- **Community engagement of affect youth and families***: creation of taskforces or committees based in the community to attract the participation of families and youth in decision-making about systems changes.

Targeted Areas for Improvement (TAI). A specific area, topic, or sub-system that Models for Change is seeking to improve or influence by using key strategies to drive change. TAIs are crucial points within the juvenile justice system that the Foundation believes would generate significant reforms if they were addressed.

Theory of Change. A "theory of change" model is a general broad scale representation of project designer beliefs about how behavioral or systems change will occur as a result of their project. It depicts the underlying assumptions and rationales held by project developers about which strategies are needed to achieve the specific project goals in a phased sequence of hypothesized cause and effects.

Theory of Action. A theory of action is similar to a theory of change but specifies a program or initiative's role in engendering change, including the specific strategies and elements of implementation that will be used to accomplish its long term goals.

Transfer provisions. There are two types of transfers that affect the juvenile justice system:

- **Discretionary transfers***: Legal provisions that dictate the circumstances under which juvenile court judges can transfer a case involving a juvenile to a criminal court (usually based on age and/or the seriousness of the offense, without consideration of the individual's background or needs).

- **Automatic or statutory transfers***: Legal provisions that send youth directly to adult criminal courts when charged with a serious crime (for example, for charges of homicide or rape). In these cases, juvenile courts are excluded from the process.

Vital Signs. Measures that reflect movement toward a model juvenile justice system (for example, reductions in racial and ethnic over-representation, juvenile transfers to adult court, and recidivism). The foundation regards the vital signs as "tools for other jurisdictions to use to assess how their system falls short of the ideal, identify areas for reform, and to measure its performance over time." The five key vital signs (or **Outcomes**) are:

1. Impartial and unbiased decision making (reduction in case-handling disparities due to race)

2. Retention in the juvenile justice system of all youth who can benefit from its programs and services (reduction in transfer and waiver to adult criminal court)

3. Youth leave the system more capable and productive than when they entered it (increase participation in rehabilitation and successful completion of education and treatment programs and services)

4. Reduction in recidivism (reduced re-offending)

5. Increased proportion of juvenile offenders handled as informally, with the least restriction, and as close to home as possible (reduction in incarceration and increase in community-based alternative sanctions)

This page has been left blank for double-sided copying.

Improving public well-being by conducting high quality, objective research and data collection

MATHEMATICA
Policy Research