

Alternatives to Detention– Theory of Change Convening

April 8, 2016

UNO Community Engagement Center

Facilitated by: Paige M. Dempsey, Director of Learning and Performance

United Way of the Midland

Purpose of this work, from Erin Bock, Sherwood Foundation¹:

Our community has come a long way over the last year in strategically partnering to reform the Juvenile Justice system in Douglas County. The strengthened relationships across the system are now enabling us to ask more assertive questions and gather catalytic evidence towards change. We are also in a position to foster mutual accountability for that change. It's up to all of us!

In that light, the OYS/JDAI Data Committee has commissioned an evaluation of the Alternatives to Detention (ATD) in Douglas County and will partner with Dr. Ryan Spohn in the implementation of that process. This evaluation is meant to ground, support, and increase efficiency for our local efforts...not duplicate or impede.

We are starting this evaluation by convening local stakeholders in a Theory of Change (TOC) process...

What follows below is a transcription and narrative of the work which was completed on April 8th, among a variety of stakeholders interested in strengthening the utilization of Alternatives to Detention across our community.²

1. WARM UP

To get a sense of who was in the room with us, participants were asked to put a sticky note on the wall to indicate their stakeholder group:

- i. Probation department
- ii. County/Attorney/Judge
- iii. Service provider
- iv. Intermediary agency/OYS/Other


Then, participants were asked to put a sticky note on the wall to indicate how well they think our community is using Alternatives to Detention thus far:

- i. Awesome, we're doing great!
- ii. We are *kind of* using it
- iii. What ATDs?!

¹ Email dated 2/10/2016 "What impact can we have with ATDs?" from Erin Bock to multiple stakeholders.

² Follow up interviews were conducted with five stakeholders who could not attend on April 8th. Their responses have been integrated into this summary.

The results were as follows, and gave us a good visual to start the day allowing that there is some work still to be done in this area.



2. SETTING THE GROUND RULES

Participants worked individually and then at their tables to craft what they wanted the day to look like by considering what they wanted to “honor” and “avoid.” The following ground rules were set, with participants agreeing to use these throughout the day’s work together.


- Honor the work already done
- Avoid dwelling on the past
- Avoid blame
- Don’t assume
- Honor vulnerability
- (We) don’t know all the answers
- Trust data for decision making
- Honor the perspectives of all, even if they are not here
- Data = a flashlight, not a hammer
- Grace
- Assume good intentions
- Listen to hear
- Honor honesty
- No rank = all equal


3. DEFINING THE PROBLEM and ALTERNATIVES

Participants were asked to consider the overarching question: *Why do we have Alternatives to Detention?*

The questions below were each written a large poster and one placed at each table. Groups spent about 5 minutes on each question writing answers, then circulating to each of the other questions. At the last table, the group would report out the collective results of the responses to that question, and in so doing, answering the bigger question of: “Why do we have Alternatives to Detention?”.

- What is the problem ATDs are attempting to address?
- How would we define ATDs?
- What is the best use for ATDs?
- How would we define “success” for an ATD?
- What are the benefits of ATDs for youth?
- What are the benefits of ATDs for families, the community and the JJS?





Responses to the questions above were reported as follows:

A. What is the problem ATDs are trying to address?

- Avoid criminal record for youth
- Promote place for youth to learn/grow – community/school/home
- Early intervention – family intervention
- Trying to create a holistic approach to ensure and outcomes for youth
- Honor diversity/situation of youth/family
- Give hope/someone gives a damn
- Heal/address the trauma in youth’s life/identify
- Eliminate bias
- Inappropriate use of confinement
- Prevent entry into JJS
- Effective support/intervention/redirect to youth who touch JSS
- Reduce DMC
- Accountability without over supervising youth
- Separation from family
- Appropriate level of consequence
- Misdiagnosis youth – behavioral issue truly mental health issue
- Balance of public safety with appropriate level of youth supervision/accountability
- Detention is expensive
- Educate the public – “Kids aren’t criminals”

Offers options appropriate to the child's needs
We need more behavioral health for youth regardless of economic status
Reduce the experience of trauma for the youth
ATDs allows the parents to become more engaged in their child's improvement
Addressing the needs of the whole child, compared to just punishing one behavior

B. How do we define Alternatives to Detention?

Continuum of least restrictive to moderately restrictive community-based options
System that aims to protect the society and promote public safety while taking care of youth in the best way possible
Targeted interventions to ensure youth appear in court and do not reoffend prior to court
Time bound and reflective of youth's needs
Not intended to address underlying issues which may require ongoing needs
Connect youth with resources to address on-going (trauma) needs
Trauma informed/non-damaging/second chance
Grace-based; Rehabilitative rather than punitive
Creative solutions (ATDs) out-of-the-box
Youth leave better than came in
Individualized services for youth that allow them to remain out of detention
Interventions designed to last less than 30 days
"Do no harm"
Don't warehouse kids – "let kids be kids"
Short term
Defined by gaps – what aren't we doing?
Least traumatizing way to improve behavior
Any option of avoiding visit to DCYC or other facilities
ATDs designed to be short term interventions (less than 30 days)

C. What is the best use for ATDs?

For treatment (vs. confinement)
Keep kids out of the pipeline/system (further involvement)
Kids w/ non-violent offenses (low level vs. violent)
To address needs of child while addressing societal demand for action
Identifying appropriate interventions
Allows a variety of options of level of ATD to match youth to the "right" service
Bring family into the conversation/give tools to the youth and family/increase communication
Assessment of underlying issue(s)
Best use is what the data tells us/define TARGET population/avoid new widening and mismatching services

Temporary solution to crisis intervention, particularly in domestic incidents/situations/ cooling off period for education of parent

When they are in the community where the youth lives

Think about “youth in crisis” model (Salt Lake City)

To assist in safety issues/ youth who are often running and engaging in dangerous activities

To help parents grow in their own capacity, work with parents to build a better understanding of their child

For those youth who don’t really pose a threat to the community or themselves, and we have a reasonable belief that they will show up the next day in court

To keep children in the least restrictive environment

Youth scoring high on the Risk Assessment instrument should be detained, others should not

Placement with family members, neighbors, faith community, etc.

Need to ensure youth don’t fail to show up for court or commit new violations

Youth should typically not be detained unless they pose a risk to themselves or others

D. How would we define “success” for ATDs?

Kids stay out of jail

Kids show up for court

Kids don’t “run”

Positively engaged in prosocial and academic pursuits

Connected to caring adult

Upon exit- plan of support

Return to school (home school)

Appropriate services delivered based upon youth’s individual needs

What does ATD consider successful completion of the program – bench marks

Wrap services with family

Contributes to court efficiency and expedite case process

Stops recidivism

Keep/works on strengthening families

No new law violations

No failure to appear and not running

Building connections/rapport for after services

Empowers professionals to streamline services

Family is better equipped for success and connected to community resources

Less disillusionment more hope to workers in the system!

Improved community perception of Juvenile Justice that we want all kids to thrive and do everything to make that happen

Public pride/ sharing and stories

Less reliance on the screening tool

No overrides of the ATD tool

Short versus long-term

Individual youth vs. system

Themes: success depends upon definition to level or ATD itself

Doing a good job of matching kids to services

E. What are the benefits of ATDs for youth?

More cost effective than detention

Healthier environment pending adjudication

Provides appropriate level of STRUCTURE

Gives hope

Help identify and fix the core issues

Better members of society (helps pave the way)

Better investment than the alternative of system involvement

Youth/families form better relationship/trust/view of the system with families

Stay in home/community

Decrease system induced trauma for youth and family

Streamline/expediting services for youth and allow time to appropriately determine needs/risks

Allows for increased family engagement and voice/choice

Stay in own school – longer term stability

Reduced costs

Minimize disruption to life

Identify previously unknown issues for youth

Educate youth about issues that brought them in

Dental, medical, Rx access/stability

Fast track back home (therapy, etc.)

Research supports how traumatizing detention can be, even briefly; ATDs are a good alternative

Allowing child to stay connected to family and community while addressing critical needs the family might have

F. What are the benefits of ATDs for: families, the community, and the JJS?

Sources of help/hope

Families remain together – pressure off parents

Cost effectiveness – youth/family served in own community

Kids maintain positive trajectory

Minimize, diffuse trauma

Public safety – individual too

Decision-makers have options/choice to meet kid where they're at


Expedites the court process and minimize delays

Assists in increasing collaboration w/in agencies

Helps family navigate resources and the system

Support cultural differences through the court process

- Early intervention prior to court
- Continuity after court
- Minimizes placements – assist w/ passing federal measures
- Accountability without compromising public safety
- Allows the system to focus resources on highest risk youth
- Allows for a continuum for youth to make mistakes (adolescent brain dev.)
- Changing family behavior will have beneficial impact
- Nailed it! Hopeful!



After answering all of the questions set forth above, the facilitator asked the group, “How would we articulate our consensus? *What is our Ultimate Goal?*” The answers to this question provided the framework for our Theory of Change work later in the day.

Ultimate Goal(s):

- Reduce use of confinement
- Right kids, right location
- Continuum of care
- Collective responsibility
- Maximize success of youth and maintain a safe community

4. COMMON VISION / GOALS FOR ALTERNATIVES TO DETENTION

Visioning Question Prompt: *What do we want to see in 3-5 years as a result of this work around alternatives to detention?*

Here we were looking for aspirations for the future of this initiative. That is, what would the group want to see become a reality? This exercise was meant to represent hopes and dreams, not limited to what participants might know is currently possible.

Participants were asked to list, individually, 5-7 elements of the vision that could be completed in the next 3-5 years.



Once participants were finished, responses were collected in a systematic manner, and then clustered in columns around similar accomplishments. Doing this allows participants to come together around a shared agenda, and all allows all voices in the room to be heard. Then, as a large group, they were asked to put a one or two word “tag” names on each group. Next, each accomplishment cluster was assigned to a small group to work on more descriptive naming around what that group of cards described. These accomplishment groups would then become the Goals/Outcomes in the Theory of Change model.



From this work, the following potential **Goals/Outcomes** emerged:

- **Education and Collaboration** - A community educated, engaged, and working together toward positive outcomes for youth and families
- **Collective Impact** – A holistic approach utilizing all tools available in the public/private sector to address the needs of kids and families
- **Trauma Informed Community** – Trauma informed care across the system and trauma informed behavioral health. Training on trauma informed care for all places and a greater use on tools such as ACE for better understanding of the amount of trauma experienced by youth
- **System Human Collaboration** – The State of Nebraska develops a system of data collection and information with the ability to be shared across systems
- **Money and Resources** – Extra resources are deployed appropriately
- **Infrastructure** – Committed to improvement
- **Model** – Our community is a leader
- **Big Hairy Goal** – Youth are successful
- **RAI (Risk Assessment Instrument)** – System fidelity and administration of RAI will lead to alignment with national standards of the override rate
- **DMC (Disproportionate Minority Contact)** – System and policy stakeholders will be trained and knowledgeable on DMC resulting in the reduction of over representation of youth of color in the system as well as the sanction matches the offense.
- **How** – Comprehensive strategies that are inclusive to all stakeholders which meet the needs of youth and their families.
- **Services** – Expanded and enhanced army of ATDs to match the right service to the right youth at the right time.
- **[Pink category** – Service of care; outside of the direct scope of ATD work, but still connected]

5. ATDs: CHALLENGES AND BARRIERS

Question prompt: *Given what we know about why we have Alternatives to Detention, and given our vision for the application of this work, what are the barriers and challenges that currently exist to implementing an Alternatives to Detention approach? Put another way, what are your “stucks”?*

Although we weren't working to solve these issues directly, it is important to acknowledge that barriers to change can exist. Barriers and challenges were written on small post-it notes and shared with the larger group. From there, the following themes emerged:

- Fear
- Funding
- Families
- Misinformation
- Mistrust at different levels of the system
- Mistrust of the tool
- Override of the ATD tool
- Lack of understanding and education of ATDs
- Lack of ATDs for kids with history of violence or sexual misconduct
- Silos/closed minds
- Lack ok...
- Punitive attitudes
- Haters!
- Mistrust
- Culture
- Other systems failure
- Complex needs of youth
- Group think
- Fear of saying what needs to be said
- Licensing of foster care homes
- Lack of sufficient shelter beds
- Need for quality evaluations
- Common vision across stakeholders not there



6. THEORY OF CHANGE WORKSHOP

Defining a Theory of Change

A theory of change (TOC) is a tool for developing solutions to complex social problems. A basic TOC explains how a group of early and intermediate accomplishments sets the stage for producing long-range results.

A theory of change represents: *how and why a complex change process will succeed* under specific circumstances.

A TOC identifies: *where you want to go, the route you will take to get there, and certain milestones* which are important in the path you will travel

A TOC is informed by: history, evidence, understanding of complex relationships among players, and macro and micro level forces

The goals set forth for creating a shared Alternatives to Detention Theory of Change were to create something that:

- 1. Enables action**
- 2. Encourages continuous learning**
- 3. Promotes shared responsibility and**
- 4. Helps demonstrate how change in our community happens as a result of our actions**

A Theory of Change can take many formats, but certain components are generally present:

- **Ultimate Goal** – Long term change you want to see as a result of this work
- **Outcomes/Results/Conditions for Goal to be successful** - What needs to happen in our community for the goal to be achieved?
- **Interventions** – What strategies will help us meet our goals? How do they help us reach our goal/by what mechanism?
- **Indicators** – What can we measure; evidence that you have reached your goal/outcome/result – what, whom, how many, by when?
- **Assumptions** – What do we think we know to be true? What do we believe are underlying causes?

Creating a theory of change is a backwards mapping project. You begin with the ultimate goal in mind, and work backwards to figure out what needs to happen to get there. Based on the work we had done previously in the day, the first two pieces were already completed: the Ultimate Goal and the Outcomes/Results/Conditions needed to reach that goal.


For our work, the Ultimate Goals (listed above) were placed at the top on pink sheets. The Outcomes/Results/Conditions (results of our visioning exercise) were then placed below on yellow sheets:



The facilitator then prompted the group, “Now that we have discerned our ultimate goal, and the outcomes we would like to see to reach that goal, we next need to consider the strategies or interventions which will move us toward those results.”

Working in small groups, participants were then asked to consider: what interventions could help us reach each outcome/result. Small groups were assigned outcomes to consider, with each half of the room considering half of the proposed outcomes/results. Strategies and interventions were captured on white sheets of paper.

While participants were working on naming strategies and interventions to reach the desired outcomes, the facilitators reorganized the goals and outcomes to represent a more hierarchical model, as Theory of Changes are often depicted as such. Once that was done, the groups and reported out on interventions, and sometimes, indicators which could be used to help determine if a particular outcome had been met.



From this work, the following potential Strategies/Interventions emerged, by category (some of these responses also serve as indicators of change):

- **Education and Collaboration** - A community educated, engaged, and working together toward positive outcomes for youth and families
 - Agree upon by disciplines
 - Ongoing education with credits for Do. Co. professionals specific to issues in Douglas County
 - Measure: percent of staff trained as indicated in "scorecard"
 - Training: Use P.H. [Project Harmony] Model with common and regular training schedule with cross cutting issues that affect all stakeholders
 - Key Champion: DCYC
- **Collective Impact** – A holistic approach utilizing all tools available in the public/private sector to address the needs of kids and families
 - A "score card" developed by agencies that measure success as outlines in the strategic plan on an annual basis.
 - Measure attendance of stakeholders in the meetings
 - Create a strategic plan for Do. Co to set goals as a community and invite stakeholders annually to celebrate success and provide a quality improvement

- **Trauma Informed Community** – Trauma informed care across the system and trauma informed behavioral health. Training on trauma informed care for all places and a greater use of tools such as ACE for better understanding of the amount of trauma experienced by youth
 - Evaluate: Needs, capacity, access, barriers, gaps relative to alternatives
 - Fill the gaps
 - Quality assurance, services adhere to trauma-informed philosophy
- **System Human Collaboration** – The State of Nebraska develops a system of data collection and information with the ability to be shared across systems
 - We adhere to a common vision, use data, stakeholders are committed, services and process are rehabilitative, access and collaboration
 - The state of NE develops a system of data collection and info with the ability to be shared across systems and humans!
- **Money and Resources** – Extra resources are deployed appropriately
 - OYS convenes appropriate stakeholders to ensure accountability
 - OYS advocates for needed resources
 - Innovation in services encouraged and supported
 - Money saved by less detention is invested in youth and families
 - Explore other revenue streams
- **Infrastructure** – Committed to improvement
 - Participation in continuous effort to examine and improve
- **Model** – Our community is a leader
 - People actually believe and share the common vision
 - Detainment is rare rather than the norm
- **Big Hairy Goal** – Youth are successful
- **RAI (Risk Assessment Instrument)** – System fidelity and administration of RAI will lead to alignment with national standards of the override rate
 - On-going training for intake officers
 - Ongoing training for system stakeholders for purpose of tool
 - Implementation of quality assurance on tool by probation
 - System support of RAI decisions to reduce fear
 - Common agenda and agreement to not blame/finger point
 - Establish a common agenda of the purpose of detention among all stakeholders
 - Create a specific system response to runaway youth
 - Use data to determine ATD's, case processing and other reason to override and create interventions and policy changes
- **DMC (Disproportionate Minority Contact)** – System and policy stakeholders will be trained and knowledgeable on DMC resulting in the reduction of over representation of youth of color in the system as well as the sanction matches the offense
 - Training across the system
 - ATD's located in local neighborhoods
 - Data evaluated at system points
 - Programs and service staff are reflective of the populations they serve
- **How** – Comprehensive strategies that are inclusive to all stakeholders which meet the needs of youth and their families.
 - Expand use of FTM, MDT and triage-type staffing in case planning at all levels
 - Incorporating youth and family voice

- **Services** – Expanded and enhanced army of ATDs to match the right service to the right youth at the right time.
 - Trauma informed community-wide approach for all professional organizations who have responsibility for youth and their families involved or impacted by the JJ system
 - Trauma informed training in every level
 - Measure: % of staff trained
- **[Pink category – Service of care; outside of the direct scope of ATD work, but still connected]**

Participants were advised that the day’s work was not a final version of a Theory of Change, but was rather a roadmap to work from and a method to illustrate the progression of how – together – they can move from the interventions to the Ultimate Goal(s).

The Theory of Change was represented like this:



A detailed version of the Theory of Change set forth above is included at the end of this report. A simpler and more direct Theory of Change will be developed as this work evolves.

Before concluding the work on the Theory of Change, the participants were asked to share **Assumptions**, or those things which people think they know to be true, which can also create mental roadblocks for moving forward in change work. The following were shared:

- Kids who run are leaving jurisdiction
- Spare the rod – spoil the child
- Scared straight works
- ATD is the governments problem to solve
- It's someone else's job
- Trauma doesn't matter
- Poor parenting causes criminal kids
- Social media is the reason kids misbehave
- My dad would've whooped my ass...
- Build more jails for them
- Nobody cares about these kids they are all gang bangers and prostitutes
- All these kids are on welfare
- Kids understand court process
- The system has to step in to do what parents won't
- Adequate community involvement in system
- They don't care
- We can't change the system
- Adequate alternatives exist
- They must be from a bad family/neighborhood
- Poor kids are at risk
- The JJ system is fair
- Families manipulate
- They are culpable and responsible
- Detention can be used to "teach a lesson" – scared straight
- We (the system) are the experts
- The system is compassionate
- One size fits all
- The system is coordinated
- Families are the problem
- The system is broken
- Confined youth deserve it
- Punks, flawed, no hope
- Detention is a safe place
- Runaways are a safety risk
- Better off confined
- There has been no change
- "Those kids"
- There are sufficient resources in JJS and appropriate funding
- Services produce immediate results
- Cultural stereotypes
- All prosecutors and law enforcement are punitive
- Everyone in detention belongs there
- Being poor is no excuse for stealing
- The right ATD exists
- Minorities always commit more crime
- Teachers are happy when kids return
- Parents know what's best
- Families are not doing the best they can
- System players know best
- We are able to know the needs of youth
- People can't change

7. UTILIZATION OF THIS WORK

Finally, at the conclusion of our time together, the participants were asked to consider, generally, who this work could benefit and how. Responses were as follows:

- i. **How can we drive our work with what we have created today?**
 - Sharing this with JDAI – things we have talked about in working groups; gives additional information as we facilitate change
 - Benefit to going to county board and city council and Nebraska state legislature to discuss big picture and impact on major metropolitan cities
 - Shared system – state of NE and their agencies – if we can just see these agencies in focus/shared systems, allowing access and sharing information between organizations
 - Douglas County has some unique challenges and this meeting touches on some of these challenges – one size doesn't fit all, and this highlights it
 - “Two plus two is never equal to 4 in our world” (probation), hard for people to understand outside of this world, all kids and families are different
 - Consensus on that there can be change (big show of hands)

- ii. **Who can benefit from this shared understanding?**
 - OYS for sure, helping to advocate which is a role of OYS to support the work going on
 - School districts
 - When we get results, what decision does the system make on a regular basis where the data will help us make those decisions
 - OYS strategic planning session – share some of this information there; state of the system is due to be released (May 6th meeting)

- iii. **Who should be the users of this work?**
 - Data is only as good as how we use it – think about what would the data mean for you and your services

8. PARTICIPATING PARTNERS

<u>Participant</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Sarah Miller	Boys Town
Lisa Blunt	Child Saving Institute
Catherine Hall	Douglas County
Shawne Coonfare	Douglas County Juvenile Assessment Center
Mark Le Flore	Douglas County Youth Center
Barry DeJong	Heartland Family Service
Kylie Homan	Heartland Family Service
Jennifer Potterf	Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services
Michelle Hug	Nebraska Department of Probation
Monica Miles-Steffen	Nebraska Department of Probation
Heather Briggs	Nebraska Department of Probation
Janee Pannkuk	Operation Youth Success
Amber Parker	Operation Youth Success
Kerri Peterson	The Sherwood Foundation
Erin Bock	The Sherwood Foundation
Will Meinen	United Way of the Midlands
Anne Herman	United Way of the Midlands
Paige Dempsey	United Way of the Midlands, Facilitator
Ryan Spohn	UNO Center for Justice Research
Roni Reiter-Palmon	UNO Industrial/Organizational Psychology Program
Tom Warren	Urban League of Nebraska
Kevin Mitchell	UNO Center for Applied Psychological Services
Madi Schoenbeck	UNO Center for Applied Psychological Services
Eve Bleyhl	Nebraska Family Support Network

Additional interviews conducted with:

LaVon Stenis Williams	ReConnect, Inc.
Mary Visek	Nebraska Department of Probation
Melissa Schaefer	Region 6
Theresa Goley	KVC Nebraska
County Attorneys	Douglas County Attorney's Office

9. ATTACHMENT

The following documents are attached for review:

- ATD Goals and Vision Strategies – Participant raw responses
- ATD Theory of Change Working Model as created by participants
- ATD Theory of Change Shared Model as revised by United Way for discussion and revision

Alternatives to Detention
Goals, Vision, Strategies
Participant Responses
4/8/16

Tag:	EDUCATION AND COLLABORATION	COLLECTIVE IMPACT	TRAUMA INFORMED COMMUNITY	SYSTEM HUMAN COLLABORATION	MONEY AND RESOURCES	INFRASTRUCTURE	MODEL	BIG HAIRY GOALS	RAI	DMC	HOW	SERVICES	PINK
Outcomes/Goals:	A community educated, engaged, and working together toward positive outcomes for youth and families	A holistic approach utilizing all tools available in the public/private sector to address the needs of kids and families	Trauma informed community wide approach for all professional organizations who responsibility for youth and their families involved or impacted by the Juvenile Justice System	The state of Nebraska develops a system of data collection and information with the ability to be shared across systems and humans	Extra resources are deployed appropriately	Committed to improvement	Our community is a leader	Youth are successful	System fidelity and administration of RAI will lead to alignment with national standards of the override rate	System and policy stakeholders will be trained and knowledgeable on DMC resulting in the reduction of over representation of youth of color in the system as well as the sanction matches the offense	Comprehensive strategies that are inclusive to all stakeholders, which meet the needs of youth and their families	Expanded and enhanced army of ATD's to match the right service to the right youth at the right time	Service of care
Elements of Vision:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Attorneys are more invested - Awaiting home - judge no longer valid reason to sit in placement - Public/private cooperation and support - More streamlined case progression - Judges educated in all service options - Enhance the efficiency in the administration of the JJ system - Community embraces use of ATD's - Case processing issues impacting detention and overrides have been accessed - LEO's understand the risk of confinement - Judges educated in all service options - Lawyers educated in all service options - Understanding and buy in to "this takes time" and consistent/focused intentional work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - OYS/JDAI are thriving places for ideas, action and dialogue - Intentional system of ATD's that address youth and community needs - Put ourselves out of work! 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Trauma informed care across the system! - Trauma informed behavioral health - Trauma/behavioral health - Training on trauma informed care for all players - Greater use of tools such as ACE for better understanding of the amount of trauma experienced by youth 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - System support for moving kids out efficiently (less trauma on kids and families and professionals) - A seamless system from start to finish for youth and families - A greater collaboration between ATD's - Multiple players are on same page for kids' needs - Regular ATD conferences (county-wide) - Definition and philosophy of ATD's is "the way we do business" - Better coordination of services - People actually believe and share the common goal - Better coordination between system stakeholders and of services - Inter agency collaboration is fluid and productive - Excellent cohesion with probation and community providers - Greater judicial involvement in this effort 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A clear well funded continuum of ATD's that rock! - Explore other revenue streams - Understanding how and where JJ money comes from and who it goes to (improve) - Innovation in services are encouraged and supported - Billing, reporting, etc. expectations known to providers and easy to fulfill - Money saved by less detention is invested in youth and families - Using money saved from detention for family services - Funding source shouldn't matter at point of intake, all options available for all kids 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Data informed and utilized to make decisions - A central data collection system that shares information across disciplines - An infrastructure (data, programs, systems) is optimized - Data collection is robust and responsive - Probation access to NFOCUS and NDEN for HHS and NFC - Information shared, common database for all agencies to store information and data in - Youth voice of needs is a primary data source - One central database - Efforts to examine and improve 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Douglas county will be recognized nationally for JDA/OYS work - Omaha/CB region is envy of the nation on how to work smart together - Omaha is the a model best practice rehabilitative system (JJ) - Omaha is a guiding model for ATD success - Safe community - Professionals go to work with excitement and hope - All interest groups working together - People actually believe in and share common vision - Detainment is rare rather than the norm - A well-run rehabilitative process for youth and families - We will not make decisions based on worse case history - County and partners are recognized for their efforts - People feel supported and valued 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kids don't come back - Less kids in jail - Recidivism is reduced - Youth leave the system better than they came in - Youth are given "credit" for their compliance while pending court - 500 kids avoided further system involvement - Reduce the reliance on the out-of-home placement and youth moving deeper in the system are few 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The only youth in detention are 1. youth with adult charges 2. 10 ^ on RAI - JJS will be empowered and supported to follow RAI recommendations - RAI override is down 20% - Is the RAI the best instrument to identify level of ATD? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduction in the disproportionate rate of confinement for minority youth - Reduction of DMC (in detention) by 90% - ATD's are located where youth live, and impact DMC - Dig deeper into DMC statistics to track crime rate verses confined rate - Reduced/no DMC in detention - YOC in detention has been down by 50% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Youth and families are a part of the decision making - Parents/families participate in capacity building classes - Services are culturally competent and linguistically appropriate - Organizations are including family voice and engaging families - Wrap services are available for families - Services are designed to keep youth at home - Less reliance on screening tools and more on family input - Parents need to be involved in the reform process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increased options for alternative education (technical schools) - Use of community services for physical health - Transitional services - Youth and families will have earlier access to needed services despite economic status - Behavioral health center or shelter - Easy access to the right ATD's at all times - ATD's that focus on career preparation - Age appropriate interventions focused on social and emotional age (not chronological) - Adding behavioral health into the continuum 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Services most important, mental health more DD funding for qualifying youth - Mental health and high risk have specific ATD's - Build tools, programs and services to address the youth with sexual offenses - All youth are receiving the right services at the right time in the right system - Kids are served by appropriate system - Determine mental and behavioral health needs; not criminal - Need is met in prevention services - System of care
Strategies Interventions Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ongoing education with credits for Do. Co. professionals specific to issues in Douglas County - Training: Use P.H. [Project Harmony] Model with common and regular training schedule with cross cutting issues that affect all stakeholders; agreed upon by disciplines - Measure: percent of staff trained as indicated in "scorecard" 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A "score card" developed by agencies that measure success as outlines in the strategic plan on an annual basis - Measure attendance of stakeholders in the meetings - Create a strategic plan for Do. Co. to set goals as a community and invite stakeholders annually to celebrate success and provide quality improvement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Evaluate: Needs, capacity, access, barriers, gaps relative to alternatives - Fill the gaps - Quality assurance, services adhere to trauma-informed philosophy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We adhere to a common vision, stakeholders are committed, services and process are rehabilitative, use data, assess, collaboration - Youth are given "credit" for their compliance while court pending - We will not make decisions based on worst case history - Omaha is a model best practice rehabilitative system (JJ) - Omaha/CB is envy of nation on how to work smart together - Omaha is a guiding model for ATD success - A well-run rehabilitative process for youth and families - Do. Co. will be recognized nationally for JDAI work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - OYS convenes appropriate stakeholders to ensure accountability - OYS advocates for needed resources - Improve understanding how and where JJ \$ comes from and goes to - Explore other revenue streams - A clear well funded continuum of ATD's that rock! - Innovation in services encouraged and supported (\$) - Billing, reporting, etc. expectations known to providers and easy to fulfill - Money saved by less detention invested in youth and families - Practices support the retention of employees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Participation in continuous effort to examine and improve - Data informed and utilized to make decisions - A central data collection system that shares information across disciplines - Probation access to NFOCUS and NDEN for HHS and NFC - Youth voice of needs is a primary data source - Informed decisions based on tool, not fear or assumptions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - People actually believe and share the common vision - Detainment is rare rather than the norm 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Look for progress not perfection 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - On going training for intake officers - Ongoing training for system stakeholders for purpose of tool - Implementation of quality assurance on tool by probation - System support of RIA decisions to reduce fear - Common agenda and agreement to not blame/fingerpoint - Establish a common agenda of the purpose of detention among all stakeholders - Create a specific system response to runaway youth - Use data to determine ATD's, case processing and other reason to override and create interventions and policy changes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Training across the system - ATD's located in local neighborhoods - Data evaluated at system points - Programs and service staff are reflective of the populations they serve 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Expand use of FTM, MDT and triage type staffings in case planning at all levels - Incorporating youth and family voice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Evaluate: Needs, Capacity, Access, Barriers, Gaps relative to alternatives - Fill the gaps! - Quality assurance - Services adhere to trauma-informed philosophy - Appropriate use of ATD's - Less kids in jail - Kids don't come back - Recidivism reduced - 500 kids avoided further system involvement - Youth leave the system better than they came in - Reduce reliance on out-of-home placement - Detainment is rare rather than the norm - Youth moving deeper in system are few 	

Alternatives to Detention Theory of Change Working Model

April 8, 2016




Disclaimer

The Theory of Change outlined in this document is not intended to be the final word on how the Alternatives to Detention outcomes should or will be reached. Rather, it is the product of the work of dedicated people who met to create a "first draft" Theory of Change. A theory of change is a living document that should be amended as new information is incorporated and goals and outcomes are refined and clarified.

powered by

Alternatives to Detention Theory of Change Shared Model

May 5, 2016



Disclaimer

The Theory of Change outlined in this document is not intended to be the final word on how the Alternatives to Detention outcomes should or will be reached. Rather, it is the product of the work of dedicated people who met to create a "first draft" Theory of Change. A theory of change is a living document that should be amended as new information is incorporated and goals and outcomes are refined and clarified.

powered by