THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

Utah Criminal Justice Center

COLLEGE OF SOCIAL WORK
COLLEGE OF SOCIAL & BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES
UTAH COMMISSION ON CRIMINAL & JUVENILE JUSTICE
S.J. QUINNEY COLLEGE OF LAW

Collaboration and Evidence-Based Practice

Utah State Office of Education and Utah Division of Juvenile Justice Services

Retrospective Evaluation Summary Report
September 10, 2013

Collaboration and Evidence-Based Practice Retrospective Evaluation Report

Utah State Office of Education and Utah Division of Juvenile Justice Services

Authors

Jennifer Loeffler-Cobia, M.S.
Senior Research Analyst

Jennie Hall, M.S
Research Analyst

September 10, 2013

Utah Criminal Justice Center, University of Utah
Robert P. Butters, Ph.D., Director

Table of Contents

Tables

Appendices

Introduction

Each year more than two million children, youth, and young adults formally come into contact with the juvenile justice system (Puzzanchera, Adams, Hockenberry, 2012). Of these youth many demonstrate poor academic performance and likely do not graduate from high school while continuing to recidivate (Leone & Weinberg, 2010). Therefore, lack of education has been identified in the research as one of the top eight criminogenic (i.e. dynamic factors correlated with recidivism) risk factors (Andrews & Bonta, 2010).

Youth involved in the juvenile justice system are often detained in a secure facility to receive treatment where educational services are also required to be delivered in-house (i.e., youth are not allowed to leave the facility). This can create a complex situation: two systems with differing goals and missions, serving the same youth; each system perceiving their roles, responsibilities, and anticipated outcomes (e.g., increase academic achievement versus reducing recidivism) as different. A key factor in improving outcomes among these youth is collaboration between systems (Crime and Justice Institute, 2009). Fostering a system of shared and coordinated responsibility is one way to improve the educational success and overall well-being of juvenile justice system-involved youth. Such a collaborative system is one in which both agencies take it upon themselves individually and communally to ensure that all youth under their care progress academically, do not reoffend, and become more productive members of society upon leaving in the juvenile justice system.

To enhance the collaboration work in the State of Utah, the Utah Criminal Justice Center (UCJC) at the University of Utah began working with the Utah State Office of Education (USOE) and the Utah Division of Juvenile Justice Services (JJS) in January 2013. This partnership allows the State of Utah to construct a collaboration roadmap for the sustainable implementation and replication of evidence-based practice (EBP) within youth in custody schools statewide, particularly schools housed in secure settings. As part of this endeavor, the UCJC has evaluated the current status of collaboration efforts across five local secure facilities. This report represents the results of that evaluation. The findings that are summarized in this retrospective evaluation will later be utilized to guide the development of a dynamic plan for the USOE and UDJJS as both agencies continue to build capacity toward sustainable collaboration implementation across the State. Ultimately, the collaboration roadmap will provide administration from both agencies with a framework to diagnose and continually improve the efficiency and effectiveness of collaboration efforts and EBP implementation.

To assist in the process of building the collaboration roadmap, information from surveys and five focus groups have been integrated into findings and recommendations across seven categories the literature suggests are characteristics of effective collaboration efforts (Borden & Perkins, 1999; Carey, 2010; Hogue, Parkins, Clark, Bergstrum, and Slinski, 1995;; Loeffler-Cobia and Guevera, 2010; Sachwald and Eley, 2008;). The categories are: *(1) Environment, (2) Evidence-Based Practice Knowledge, (3) Staff Characteristics; (4) Process and Structure, (5) Communication, (6) Purpose, and (7) Resources.*

This summary offers recommendations to guide the roadmap process by identifying the elements of strength and areas of improvement for each category, along with what most focus group participants regarded as and the essential elements for successful collaboration. See Table 1, on the following page, for a list of the key findings of this retrospective evaluation.

Table 1. Collaboration and Evidence-Based Practice Evaluation Key Findings

Category	Key Findings

Environment	• Overall JJS staff and Local Education Agency (LEA) teachers agreed that there is a strong collaborative environment between both agencies.
	
	• Staff from both agencies defined collaboration as a way to exchange information between numerous agencies to help with problem-solving, understanding youth's needs, and overall producing better outcomes.
	
	• Both LEA teachers and JJS staff agreed on the following criteria for a healthy collaborative environment:
	   o Positive Attitudes
	   o Trust
	   o Respect
	   o Flexible
	   o Creating the environment as "one agency".
	
	• Most staff stated that JJS and USOE administrators should lead collaboration efforts to be an example of collaboration for staff from both agencies.
	
	• Teachers do not always feel supported by LEA administrators and feel they receive more support from JJS facility administrators.

Evidence-Based Practice Knowledge	• Knowledge of EBP and implementation varies across facilities. • Most teachers are eager to learn more about EBP and what impact their role plays in increased communication and reducing recidivism.
Membership Characteristics	• Most facility staff (both agencies) reported that they have a good rapport with one another and trust in the services each agency provides. • Teachers are not involved in the formal collaboration efforts of JJS criminogenic case planning, which include: intake staffing, reassessment of the Protective and Risk Factor Assessment (PRA), or exit staffing. • Teachers are particular about the information they receive regarding youth criminality. Teachers consistently report that learning about youth's criminal history would interfere with their ability to teach effectively. However, teachers would like to learn more about criminogenic needs related to interactions in the classroom.

Process and Structure	• Most staff from both agencies agreed that not enough time is invested in collaboration or implementation efforts. • Staff from both agencies report being resistant to change and having a hard time when changes are made within their facilities. • LEA teachers and JJS staff have a clear understanding about their individual roles, responsibilities and outcomes as it pertains to their individual agency. They also appear to understand the role and responsibilities of the other agency, but do not understand how their roles are shared in regard to common outcomes. • Teachers do not feel that they have the necessary information (i.e., criminogenic risk and protective factors and case plan) to speak as LEA decision makers in EBP processes.
Communication	• Staff from both agencies report that communication between agencies is positive and constructive. However, communication styles vary among sites. Some communication is exchanged through formal feedback meetings while other communication is conducted informally. • Staff from both agencies reported that receiving school record information in a timely manner was a difficult process that interferes with their ability to address the educational needs of the students.
Purpose	• LEA teachers and JSS staff have a clear understanding about their individual mission and vision as it pertains to their individual agency. They appear to also have a clear understanding of the other agency's mission and vision; however, there is not a developed shared vision between both agencies. • There is disagreement among teachers and JJS staff regarding the dedication in each facility to making collaboration and EBP implementation a part of the way "business is done."
Resources	• Most staff said that they would be willing to participate in more collaboration efforts and trainings, regardless of funds, if the outcome was to help the youth they serve. • Staff from both agencies report having enough staff to meet the needs of youth and their agencies. • Staff at one of the facilities reported that the employment of a school Education Transition and Career Advocate (ETCA) has improved collaboration and transition efforts at their facility.

Background

In September of 2012, the USOE received an award from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention's State Training and Technical Assistance Center (STTAC) to develop a best practice collaboration process between LEA teachers and the JJS secure staff. The award from STTAC allowed USOE and JJS to develop a four-phase evaluation and quality improvement process that would span the course of 16-months (-see Scope of Work in Appendix A). The project consists of four phases: 1) *Evaluation Purpose and Process Development,* 2) *Needs and Resources Assessment,* 3) *Strategic Planning* and 4) *Capacity Building*. Once phase one was completed with STTAC funding, the USOE continued funding to implement the remaining phases. In January 2013, the USOE and the JJS partnered with the University of Utah's UCJC to embark on the implementation of the remaining collaboration phases.

The UCJC worked with both agencies to implement the second phase of the best practice collaboration process. The second phase consisted of development, administration and analysis of surveys and focus groups conducted with staff from both agencies. The evaluation focused on five secure facilities that incorporated educational services in-house. The secure facilities included in the evaluation were:
- Millcreek Youth Center;
- Decker Lake Youth Center;
- Genesis Youth Center;
- Cache Observation and Assessment Center (O&A); and
- Salt Lake Observation and Assessment Center (O&A).

This report represents the results of the evaluation. The findings that are summarized in this report will later be used by the USOE and JJS to diagnose and continually improve the efficiency and effectiveness of collaboration efforts and EBP implementation, in essence guiding phase three and four and any future collaboration efforts.

Purpose of the Evaluation

To gain a better understanding of collaboration best practices among educational agencies and juvenile secure facilities in Utah, the USOE partnered with both the JJS and UCJC in FY13 to embark upon a collaboration retrospective evaluation and quality improvement process. The purpose of this study is twofold: 1) to identify current collaboration best practices and areas of improvement and 2) to develop a collaboration roadmap for the sustainable implementation and replication of EBP within youth in custody schools statewide, particularly schools housed in secure settings. The following goals were established by both the USOE and JJS to support the project's purpose:

1. To determine critical collaboration success factors that positively impact youth-in-custody outcomes.
2. To develop inexpensive systems for regular communication & planning between local JJS staff and LEA teachers that will positively impact their common clients (i.e., youth who are in JJS custody.
3. To create an effective and sustainable collaboration process to transition school record information between LEA and JJS for youth-in-custody.
4. To create local "ownership" within JJS staff and LEA teachers in the competent and continuous usage of collaboration, strategic planning, continuous quality improvement, and the use of evidence-based practices.
5. To create local and state capacity to carry the above processes forward to other sites once phase two is complete (*Needs and Resources Assessment*).

Collaboration Evidence Based-Practice Methodology

Phase One: Evaluation Purpose and Process Development

The UCJC research team worked with both the USOE and UDJJS administration to develop the purpose and direction of this evaluation, select the five pilot sites, and determine what data collection methods would be necessary to meet the goals of the evaluation. A summary of the meetings are provided in *Table 2.*

Table 2. Phase One Development Meetings

Meeting Purpose	Date	Participants
Collaboration Introduction and STTAC Funding	September 24, 2012	USOE Administration JJS Administration OJJDP Consultant
Site Selection and Assessment Planning Process Development	October 1, 2012	USOE Administration JJS Administration OJJDP Consultant
USOE and JJS Director Meeting	October 23, 2012	USOE Administration LEA Administrators JJS Administration JJS Program Directors OJJDP Consultant

Phase Two: Needs and Resources Assessment

Phase two of the project *(Needs and Resources Assessment)* was designed to evaluate current collaboration efforts between the LEA teachers and JJS secure staff. The information obtained during the evaluation was used to identify areas of common best practice, as well as, areas that were in need of improvement and recommendations for collaboration strategic planning, and capacity building. Two steps were developed to obtain this information: 1) Collaboration Evidence-Based Practice Survey Development and Administration and 2) Collaboration Focus Group Development and Facilitation.

Collaboration Evidence-Based Practice Survey Development and Administration

Purpose

The *Collaboration Evidence-Based Practice Survey (CEBPS)* was designed to provide insight into the collaboration dynamics and elements of daily work practices between teachers and JJS secure facility staff that may be impacting proximal and distal outcomes of youth served in secure facilities. The results inform and guide the collaboration evaluation and the development of the roadmap during *Phase Three: Strategic Planning.*

Development and Sampling

To evaluate the current collaboration practices between teachers and JJS staff the *CEBPS* was developed by UCJC. After a thorough review of the literature for both collaboration best practices and existing surveys, it was determined that no existing survey would meet the needs of the project or provide the desired information. The UCJC research team used the best practice literature in both collaboration and EBP implementation to help guide development of the CEBPS survey. The *CEBPS* was comprised of the following seven subscales: Environment, Evidence-Base Practice Knowledge, Staff Characteristics,

Process and Structure, Communication, Purpose, and Resources. A copy of the full survey tool is provided in Appendix B of this report.

The UCJC research team worked with both the USOE and JJS administrators to review the *CEBPS* and determine the appropriate scales and question-language for surveying their staff. It was determined that the above mentioned scales were appropriate to use with all staff.

After determining the make-up of the *CEBPS* scales, a comprehensive staff list was provided to the UCJC research team by the USOE and JJS research department directors. The staff lists were classified for each pilot site into the following groups: JJS Supervisor, JJS Counselor III, JJS Counselor II, JJS Counselor I, and LEA teacher. The *CEBPS* was disseminated to all staff on the list.

Overall, 171 staff members comprised the comprehensive list of eligible staff to be surveyed. The *CEBPS* was sent to all staff via online format. Seventy-eight (78) participants responded to the *CEPBS* (25 Millcreek Youth Center, 20 Decker Lake Youth Center, 7 Cache O&A, 6 Salt Lake O&A, and 20 Genesis Youth Center), for a 45% response rate. *Table 3* portrays the total number of staff surveyed and for each pilot site's classification and their response rate. For example, 6 supervisors were surveyed at Millcreek Youth Center and 66% of them responded (N=4).

Table 3. Response Rate Per Pilot Site and Classification

	Millcreek Youth Center		Decker Lake Youth Center		Cache O&A		Salt Lake O&A		Genesis Youth Center	
	n	Response Rate	n	Response Rate	n	Response Rate	n	Response Rate	n	Response Rate
JJS Supervisor	6	66%	3	100%	1	100%	3	33%	3	66%
JJS III	12	16%	6	50%	2	0%	3	33%	5	40%
JJS II	34	35%	10	30%	3	66%	6	0%	11	36%
JJS I	8	12%	5	20%	1	0%	4	0%	5	60%
LEA Teacher	9	33%	7	85%	4	75%	4	50%	5	100%
Local Education Administrator	2	100%	1	0%	1	0%	1	0%	1	100%
UDJJS Administrator	1	100%	1	100%	1	100%	1	100%	1	100%
Total	**72**	**34%**	**33**	**60%**	**13**	**53%**	**22**	**27%**	**31**	**64%**

Description of Participants

The description section of the *CEBPS* elicited information about participants' gender and the number of years of experience they had working with high risk youth (see Table 4 on the following page). Survey respondents were almost evenly split between females (n=37) and males (n=41) and three-quarters (73%) had at least 6 years of experience working with high risk youth in a secure facility.[1]

---

[1] Not all participants provided answers to the demographic questions. Numbers and percentages are based on answered questions.

Collaboration Evidence-Based Practice Focus Group Development and Facilitation

Purpose

To further understand the current collaboration dynamics and practices, a qualitative evaluation was also conducted. The evaluation consisted of five focus groups: one for each pilot site that included staff from both JJS and LEA. The purpose of these focus groups was to supplement the information that was gathered through the CEBPS survey.

Table 4. Description of CEBP Survey Participants

	Millcreek Youth Center	Decker Lake Youth Center	Cache O&A	Salt Lake O&A	Genesis Youth Center	Total
Gender						
Female	9	11	3	2	12	**37**
Male	16	8	4	4	9	**41**
Years of Experience Working with High Risk Youth						
0-5 Years	6	4	0	1	10	**21**
6-10 Years	4	1	4	1	5	**15**
11-15 Years	9	6	2	2	2	**21**
16+ Years	7	9	1	2	4	**23**

Development and Sampling

Focus group participants were identified through a proportional stratified random sample process from the comprehensive list provided for the *CEBPS*. This type of sampling ensures that staff in each classification (i.e., JJS Supervisor, JJS Counselor III, JJS Counselor II, JJS Counselor I, and LEA Teacher) had an equal chance of being selected for each pilot site.

Overall, 160 staff members were eligible to be sampled and one-quarter (26%, 42) were selected to participate in the focus groups (see Table 5 on the following page). [2]

Description of Participants

Focus groups consisted of 6 to 11 participants per group. The average number of participants in each group was eight. A description of the focus group participant breakdown is provided in Table 5.

Table 5. Description of Focus Group Participants

Focus Group	Total Number	Gender		Position Classification				
		Male	Female	JJS Sup	JJS Coun III	JJS Coun II	JJS Coun I	LEA Teacher
Millcreek Youth Center	11	6	5	2	2	3	1	3
Decker Lake Youth Center	8	3	5	1	2	1	1	3
Cache O&A	6	3	3	1	1	1	1	2
Salt Lake O&A	6	4	2	1	1	1	1	2
Genesis Youth Center	11	7	4	1	3	3	2	2
Totals	**42**	**23**	**19**	**6**	**9**	**9**	**6**	**12**

---

[2] Administration was removed from the focus group sampling to lessen the likelihood staff would not participate candidly with authority present.

Focus Group Implementation

During the months of May and June 2013, selected participants took part in focus groups. Staff were asked to draw upon their experience collaborating with other agencies that serve the same youth in secure facilities. Each group was asked a series of questions developed by the UCJC, which related to the overall goals (see *Appendix C for Focus Group Guide*). Specific locations and dates of the focus groups are provided in Table 6.

Table 6. Collaboration Pilot Site Focus Groups

Focus Group	Location	Date
Millcreek Youth Center	Ogden, Utah	June 12, 2013
Decker Lake Youth Center	Salt Lake City, Utah	May 7, 2013
Cache O&A	Logan, Utah	May 8, 2013
Salt Lake O&A	Salt Lake City, Utah	June 4, 2013
Genesis Youth Center	Salt Lake City, Utah	May 23, 2013

Each focus group meeting lasted approximately two hours, and had a moderator and note taker. The moderator provided background information, an overview of what to expect, and a few ground rules. The focus groups were conducted using a moderator guide with 31 questions pertaining to the seven subscales (mentioned above) for each pilot site. The information was captured on flip charts and field notes. Information was validated providing a summary after each question/category and at the end of each focus group so that participants could correct any misperceptions and/or add information. Information was then summarized and analyzed for use in this report.

Overall, the focus group participants represented the pilot sites. Participants had a variety of years of experience working with high risk youth, held different position classifications, and included both males and females. Of all of the selected participants, only eight individuals were unable to attend the focus group. In general, participants were informed, experienced, articulate, and were able to provide the information being sought. In most cases, the group dynamics were lively and interactive.

Aggregate Summary Report

To provide guidance to the USOE and JJS on the development of the collaboration roadmap, information from both the *CEBPS* and focus groups have been aggregated in the following summary report. The summary report is categorized into seven areas: *(1) Environment, (2) Evidence-Based Practice Knowledge, (3) Membership Characteristics, (4) Process and Structure, (5) Communication, (6) Purpose, and (7) Resources*. Based on the above data collection methodologies, the summary report identifies key findings pertaining to how staff view current EBP implementation collaboration between the two agencies and provides recommendations for moving forward with strategic planning and continuous quality improvement. The findings and recommendations will later be used to diagnose and continually improve the efficiency and effectiveness of educational service delivery, recidivism rates, and overall youth outcomes.

1) Environment

This area examines how staff from both agencies view the history of collaboration within their facility, leadership, and collaborative climate. This area includes the following subscales: History of Collaboration in the Facility, Staffing Collaborative Team and Leadership, and Favorable Collaborative Climate.

History of Collaboration in the Facility

- Most staff from both agencies report having a history of a collaborative environment for their facility and have demonstrated a willingness to work together to solve problems.
- Most staff from both agencies define collaboration as a way to exchange information between numerous agencies to help with problem solving, understanding youth's needs, and overall producing better outcomes. Examples of collaboration efforts reported were: developing school reports for JJS staff and working together to develop the same daily ratings for youth to manage behavior while in the classroom and to provide progress reports to JJS staff.
- Most staff from both agencies reported that teachers have been primarily responsible for providing behavior management during class hours. Most teachers prefer to handle the initial behavior problems before involving JJS staff. However, teachers reported feeling supported by JJS and do not hesitate to ask for help when behavior problems escalate.
- Most JJS staff do not physically remain in the classroom during class hours, but all facilities have JJS staff in view of the classroom at all times. Teachers are split about 50/50 in their preference; half would like to have JJS staff in the classroom while the half would not. JJS staff reported that historically they have not joined the classroom due to limited resources.

Collaborative Team and Leadership

- Most staff agreed that administrators from both USOE and JJS should lead collaboration efforts; to be an example of collaboration for the staff in both agencies. They also agreed that once the example is set by leadership that it is the JJS line staff and teachers that need to implement collaboration efforts and continued sustainability since they are the ones conducting the day-to-day operations.
- Both JJS staff and teachers report that JJS leadership is supportive of collaboration efforts. However, staff from both agencies report that teachers have not always been supported by the Local Education Agency (LEA) administration. Sixty percent (60%) of the pilot sites have a LEA and JJS administration meeting once a week to discuss problems and develop solutions,

while 40% do not have a standard meeting time for both agencies. Some teachers at various sites suggested that they felt more supported by the JJS administration than their own LEA.

Favorable Collaborative Climate

- Most staff from the two agencies agreed that collaboration is a joint effort and cannot be implemented without a commitment from leadership, JJS line staff, and teachers.
- It was reported that there has been a history of lack of support from Local Education Agency (LEA) administrators for teachers who work in secure facilities (see comments above), but that administration has recently changed for some facilities. It was reported that this change has improved the collaborative climate immensely for these facilities.
- Both teachers and JJS staff agreed that the following criteria are required to have a functional collaborative environment: positive attitudes; trust among agency staff, respect for one another, being flexible and valuing others opinions and experiences; and viewing the environment as "one agency" with common goals.
- However, when asked to rate themselves on how well their facilities were meeting these criteria (1 being extremely poor and 10 being extremely high) the ratings varied between 4-9, with the majority reporting rating their facilities at the lower end.

Recommendations – Environment

- A change in core business practices is never simple. Change takes time, energy, effort, communication, dedication, creativity, and collaboration. There are inevitable struggles that occur during execution and not all obstacles will be recognized until they are experienced. It seems that there is currently a strong collaborative environment that exists between teachers and JJS staff within each facility. This environment will work favorably for continuous quality improvement in collaboration efforts.
- While most staff agreed on a definition of collaboration, it will be important to develop and disseminate a standard definition for both agencies. A standardized definition will help set the core foundation for collaborative efforts in the future.
- Ensure a standard protocol is developed for each facility for how problem behavior is coordinated and managed. Most sites had a standard practice but nothing was formally documented. Determining a behavior management system that both JJS staff and teachers use to manage behavior can limit inconsistent messages to youth in and out of the classroom. This does not need to be a standard practice across all facilities but rather letting each facility and all staff (LEA and JJS) develop a practice that works for their environment and the type of youth they work with.
- Comprehensive agency collaboration requires strong leadership. While LEA administrators cannot be in every facility all the time, it is important that teachers feel supported and have opportunities to share ideas with their own administration. Without strong leadership, collaboration and EBP implementation is not possible.   Assessment and competency development among leaders at all levels build capacity for change.[3]

---

[3] Profiles International: Leadership Developments. *The CheckPoint 360°™* is used primarily to evaluate and promote the effectiveness of managers and leaders.

2) *Evidence-Based Practice Knowledge*

This area examines current knowledge of EBP (i.e., risk assessment development, criminogenic case planning, and transition planning) among staff from both agencies. This area includes the following two subscales: Evidence-Based Practice and Education as a Criminogenic Need.

Evidence-Based Practice

- Overall most staff from both agencies reported a general knowledge of EBP. However, teachers from most facilities reported that more EBP training would be helpful to be able to "speak the same language" as JJS staff and gain a greater knowledge of how education is a criminogenic need in relation to recidivism.
- Eighty percent (80%) of JJS Staff reported using a risk assessment to identify risk levels to recidivate and criminogenic needs and develop case plans for treatment. However, most of the teachers reported that they were not aware of a risk assessment, nor were they involved in case planning with JJS staff.
- Staff from both agencies reported that they felt that implementing behavior changing techniques, (e.g., cognitive behavior techniques) both in and out of the classroom, was important. However, there were inconsistencies between the staff on what techniques were being used.

Education as a Criminogenic Need

- Not all staff from the two agencies were familiar with the term *criminogenic*, but staff from all facilities agreed that a lack of educational achievement is a risk factor for recidivism.
- Teachers from all facilities reported that they have not had formal training in EBP and feel that it would be important to: 1) understand their student's needs better, 2) be more involved in the identification of risk factors and case planning, and 3) increase the lines of communication by creating a similar language between teachers and JJS staff.

Recommendations – Evidence-Based Practice Knowledge

- Not all JJS staff reported having EBP training. Prior and current EBP training schedules and curricula for JJS staff should be reviewed for: (1) alignment with all components of EBP, (2) which staff have had basic training in the aforementioned areas, (3) which staff have had booster trainings and/or coaching, and (4) what gaps need to be bridged.
- EBP trainings should also be incorporated into teachers' existing training schedules. This can be done by reviewing the training schedule with JJS and exploring the option of having teachers train alongside JJS staff for certain aspects of EBP. Teacher trainings could include: 1) introduction to EBP research, 2) protective and risk assessment components and relation to criminogenic case planning, 3) teachers' roles in EBP implementation, 4) Motivational Interviewing techniques, and 5) a general overview of the juvenile court system.
- Some other areas of training to consider: cognitive behavioral techniques and behavior management (e.g., reinforcers through rewards or sanctions).

3) *Membership Characteristics*

This area examines how staff from both agencies view trust, respect, and the ability to compromise. It also seeks to gain an understanding of what staff characteristics are needed for major collaborative efforts involving EBP. This area includes the following subscales: Mutual Respect, Understanding, and Trust; Appropriate Cross Section of Members; Members See Collaboration as in Their Self-Interest; and Ability to Compromise.

Mutual Respect, Understanding, and Trust

- Ninety percent (90%) of staff from both agencies reported having good rapport with one another, respect and trust the work that each do, and have a common goal.
- Some barriers to trust were reported at nearly half (40%) of the facilities:
  - Some facilities stated that it is hard to build trust when new teachers and JJS staff are hired because "trust takes time."
  - Some staff also stated that having substitute teachers is a barrier because they are not trained to teach in a secure facility.
  - Some teachers also reported that as employees of the LEA they are entitled to receive special privileges (e.g., time off), and that this may cause distrust among JJS staff.
  - One site identified "blaming" as a barrier, and indicated that some staff are unwilling to take responsibility for problems.

Appropriate Cross Section of Members

- Sixty percent (60%) of sites incorporate an intake staffing to review each youth's case, criminal history, Protective and Risk Factor Assessment (PRA), and criminogenic case plan.
- Intake staffings at most sites include: JJS case managers, cottage lead/supervisors, Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS) case workers, nurses, therapists, family members, and probation officers.
- Historically teachers have not participated in intake staffings unless there is an Individual Education Plan (IEP) issue to address. School information is provided by teachers to JJS staff to use for *Domain 2: School* of the PRA and criminogenic case planning. School information is ideally provided before the intake staffing by teachers, but there are inconsistencies among sites. Teachers and JJS staff from some of the facilities reported having a hard time obtaining school records from school districts, often times due to the sporadic school involvement of these youth.
- Most teachers indicated that they did not want to be involved in the intake staffings, as learning too much about the youth's criminal activities would negatively impact their view of the youth and would distract them from their primary goal of educating. However, teachers did report that they would appreciate more criminogenic information about the youth that may impact their teaching styles or interactions with them in the classroom (e.g., youth's attitudes toward authority, mental health, substance abuse, or consequential thinking).
- One facility recently employed a school ETCA to help facilitate obtaining school records and collaboration between JJS staff, teachers, and administrators. Both JJS staff and teachers from this site reported that having this position has increased the amount of communication and collaboration within their facility and has provided a smoother transmission of information (e.g., school records).
- All sites conduct an exit staffing before a youth leaves the facility. The purpose of the exit staffing is to review each youth's progress on their criminogenic goals and develop a

transition plan. The same agencies are involved in the exit staffing as in the intake staffing. Teachers are not formally involved but provide progress reports and recommendations for mainstream education and/or vocational training prior to the meeting.

- Most sites felt that they had the appropriate agencies attending the intake staffings but that teachers should be at the table for exit staffings to help guide the transition plan.

Members See Collaboration as in their Self-Interest

- Most teachers reported that they would like to be more involved in the education aspects of the PRA and educational planning, but not necessarily be involved in the formal intake staffings.
- JJS staff agreed that having teachers more involved in understanding the criminogenic aspects of case planning would help both agencies work under similar philosophies and provide more consistent practices (i.e., speaking the same language).
- Most staff from both agencies agreed that their facility would benefit from improving collaboration efforts and a better understanding of their role in implementing EBP.

Ability to Compromise

- As previously mentioned, information regarding the past behavior and behavioral issues of youth in these facilities are shared with teachers on a "need to know" basis.
- Most teachers provide progress reports to JJS staff about educational issues and any behavior problems that occur in class. JJS staff discuss this information at their weekly staff meetings. It appears that each facility has a very informal process for how input is provided to the criminogenic case plan or changes that staff can make to that plan as they learn more about each youth's educational needs. The primary process of case planning is for the JJS case manager to conduct the PRA and determine the criminogenic case plan for each youth. This process should involve teacher input, but most teachers reported that they have limited interaction with case managers and are not given the opportunity to provide formal input for the educational section of the criminogenic case plan.
- One facility invites teachers (or the school ETCA) to their weekly staff meetings, but teachers often find that burdensome due to the time of the meeting (after school hours).

Recommendations – Member Characteristics

- Most agency staff report that they have strong trust and respect for one another. This is a very important characteristic for collaborating members to possess. Continuing this will enhance collaboration efforts to be successful and sustained.
- Across all facilities it was reported that teachers are not involved in intake staffings. Teachers provide what educational information they have prior to the meeting. Teachers do not feel that they should be involved in this initial meeting due to learning too much about the youth's criminal activity, tainting the view teachers may have for their students. Understanding that concern, it is important that teachers receive appropriate information from the initial staffings (e.g., attitudes or behaviors that may impact the teaching environment) and have more input into: (1) the PRA *Domain 2 School* section updates and 2) criminogenic case plan updates for educational issues/progress along with behavior and attitudes. Youth interact with teachers the better part of the day and teachers have great insight into their behavior and interactions with others. This is a good opportunity for JJS staff and teachers to build collaboration efforts and better communication to address educational and other criminogenic needs.

Utah Criminal Justice Center
College of Social Work
THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

Collaboration and Evidence-Based Practice
Retrospective Evaluation Summary Report

- As mentioned above, one facility has employed a school ETCA to help coordinate school information to both teachers and JJS staff. The staff of this facility reported that this position has been a critical function and has enhanced collaboration efforts immensely. Understanding that resources may be sparse, it may be beneficial to explore this option for all facilities. The ETCA could function as a teacher representative at intake and exit staffings and work as a champion for both agencies by: 1) limiting the information teachers receive about youth criminal behavior; 2) providing teachers with more criminogenic information that may help with better in-class behavior management (e.g., attitudes toward authority); and 3) providing a teacher representative at JJS weekly staff meetings (during the educational time on the agenda) to provide progress updates and take information back to the teachers, as well as offer recommendations at the exit staffing.

4) *Process and Structure*

This area examines how staff from both agencies view their roles and responsibilities in not only collaboration but also implementing EBP and achieving the same desired youth outcomes. This area also examines how flexible and adaptable staff perceive themselves and others. This area includes the following subscales: Members Share a Stake in Both EBP Process and Outcome, Multiple Layers of Participation, Flexibility and Adaptability, and Development of Clear Roles and Responsibilities.

Members Share a Stake in Both EBP Process and Outcome

- Most staff agreed that the two agencies do not invest enough time in collaborative efforts, and that collaboration is primarily done informally between JJS staff and teachers.
- JJS staff reported that the commitment level to implementing EBP is low in their facility, while teachers were more neutral on their commitment levels.
- Most JJS staff and teachers reported that it is important for all staff to have the necessary skills to implement EBP with fidelity in order to make EBP endeavors successful. Staff from both agencies suggested that their lower commitment level to implementing EBP may be due to not feeling confident in their EBP skills.
- According to JJS staff and teachers, administrators are not providing them with the necessary time to implement process changes.

Multiple Layers of Participation

- As mentioned in the previous section, teachers are not involved in the criminogenic case planning process. It was reported that teachers give some educational feedback, but not for case planning recommendations.
- Teachers do not see themselves as agency decision makers in EBP processes and do not feel that they can speak for the agency as a whole.

Flexibility and Adaptability

- Facilities are divided down the middle in how flexible staff are when decisions are made that affect everyone and how open people are to discussing different options. Some facilities seem to be more flexible than others. Some facilities have incorporated an "open door" policy where information is exchanged and both agency staff are encouraged to share ideas and try innovative techniques; while other facilities report that each agency is responsible for their own decision making and how it affects their agency.

- Staff from both agencies report being resistant to change and having a hard time when changes are made within their facility.

Development of Clear Roles and Responsibilities

- Most agency staff reported clearly understanding their roles and responsibilities in their facility. Teachers reported that their primary role is to provide education services to high risk youth in secure facilities. One facility's teachers also reported that their role was different than at mainstream schools because they were not only trying to educate high risk youth but also to be a role model and help the youth create a different outlook on life.
- JJS staff reported that their role was to clearly provide supervision and a safe environment for high risk youth. Some JJS staff reported that they are also responsible for providing treatment opportunities, counseling, and building accountability.
- As one might expect, teachers primarily saw themselves as educators and reported that improving educational outcomes was their main priority. JJS staff reported that community safety and recidivism were the primary outcomes that they were concerned with.

<u>*Recommendations – Process and Structure*</u>

- Results from this section coincide with results from the *Environment Section*. Both teachers and JJS staff agreed that positive attitudes, trust among agency staff, respect for one another, being flexible and valuing others opinions and experiences, and viewing the environment as "one agency" with common goals are required to have a functional collaborative environment. However, as seen in the results from the current section, both agencies have room to grow in this area.
- Part of becoming an evidence-based system is ensuring that all staff either have or acquire the skills necessary to implement EBP (i.e., adaptability, flexibility, efficacy, and ability to seek out professional growth). This allows a system to increase the prospect of achieving its desired outcomes. It is often difficult to identify staff members' current skill levels, what skills need to be enhanced, and what type of training is needed to assist staff. It may be important to assess both agency staff members' current skill sets and use the information to guide training opportunities. One resource to do this is *the Evidence-Based Practice Skills Assessment (EBPSA)* (Ameen, Loeffler-Cobia, Clawson, & Guevara, 2010).This tool has been designed to address this need and using the tool will help identify the EBP knowledge, skill strengths, and needs of staff. The EBPSA tool can also be used to continue the learning process and enhance training, coaching, and feedback mechanisms. When staff are confident in their abilities they are more likely to be champions for change and not resisters of change.
- While it is understandable for each agency staff to identify their role, responsibilities, and desired outcomes as different (each agency works under a different mission statement) it is important for systems that provide services to the same high risk youth (especially those that work in the same facility) to formulate shard EBP philosophies and outcomes. Evidence-based philosophies should be woven into daily work for JJS staff, teachers and agency administrators; all working with the same foundation to decrease criminogenic risk factors (e.g., lack of education) and overall reduce recidivism (see also *Purpose Section* of this report).
- Where teachers are working in a juvenile justice facility without fulltime LEA administration present, it is important that they, along with JJS staff, feel that they are leaders within the system, regardless of their position. Leadership training may be appropriate to provide a better understanding of the meaning of leadership and the characteristics of a good leader (Heiftetz, Grawshow, & Linksky, 2009).

5) *Communication*

This area examines how staff from both agencies communicate the needs of youth and current processes for sharing information (i.e., direction/flow/planning). This area includes the following two subscales: Open and Frequent Communication and Established Relationships and Communication Links.

Open and Frequent Communication

- Communication between agency staff about youth needs and the frequency of communication varies among the facilities. Some facilities have developed more formal processes for communication among staff from the two agencies, while other facilities rely on more informal paths. For example, one facility employs a school ETCA whose primary role is to help bridge the communication gap between teachers and JJS staff. The intent of this position is to obtain youth school records in a more timely manner to help inform both educational and criminogenic case planning. The school ETCA also attends both JJS and teacher staff meetings to help keep both agencies informed of youth needs in and out of the classroom.
- Other facilities report that while communication is strong between teachers and JJS staff, it is conducted on a more informal and as needed basis. Most facilities do not require teachers to attend JJS staff meetings or vice versa. Communication about youth needs and behavior issues is usually conducted through weekly progress reports from teachers to JJS staff about youth's behavior school ratings or in passing in the hallways. Furthermore, it was rare for JJS staff from any facility to report providing teachers with information on youth criminogenic need areas that would impact successful teaching activities.

Established Relationships and Communication Links

- As mentioned in the *Membership Characteristic Section,* relationships and trust between teachers and JJS staff are strong. JJS staff and teachers at most of the facilities report a mutual respect for each other and indicate that they feel supported by one another.
- Most facilities reported that there is a breakdown in how school information (e.g., school credits) is transferred from mainstream school to the secure facility where the youth resides. It was reported by staff at both agencies that this process can take anywhere from two to six weeks. Frequently the youth's PRA has already been conducted and their criminogenic case plan developed before school records are available. All staff reported being frustrated with the inefficiencies of this process and how it negativity impacts criminogenic and education case planning. For example, since teachers are not usually involved in initial case staffings[4] it is their responsibility to provide education information to either case managers or youth advocates before the initial staffing takes place. Since obtaining school information can take some time, JJS staff do not have adequate information to develop a comprehensive criminogenic case plan as it pertains to educational needs, nor do the teachers. The criminogenic case plan is usually updated after school records are obtained. Some sites reported that they use internal assessments to help provide educational need information to JJS staff while waiting for formal records.

---

[4] Please see the *Membership Characteristics* Section for more detailed information about teacher involvement in intake staffings, the PRA and criminogenic case planning)

Recommendations – Communication

- While communication between JJS and teachers does not seem to be a major concern among staff, there are some inconsistencies about communication processes within facilities. For collaboration and EBP implementation to be successful it is essential that common communication practices between JJS, teachers, and administrators are developed. One facility has already employed a school ETCA to help bridge the communication gaps between agencies and provide the necessary school information in a more timely manner. There is an opportunity to use this situation as a learning opportunity. Identify the strengths and areas of improvement from this process and use learned information to develop capacity in other facilities (see also recommendations from the *Membership Characteristics* section).

- Explore options to linking PRA criminogenic information, school record information, and criminogenic case planning. As stated in above sections, teachers would like to have certain information from the PRA about their student's attitudes toward criminal behavior, skills, and education that would help with their education planning. Staff from both agencies also note that they would like to have a better system for obtaining school records. It will be important to explore current resources and any existing committees that are working on this issue; as to not duplicate efforts. One example of a current resource that is in development is aggregate level criminogenic reports from JJS for each youth. These reports are designed to provide criminogenic information to treatment providers without infringing on confidentially.

- Use agency administration and staff meetings as an opportunity for conversations about EBP implementation. Getting all staff more involved in the process will help to connect the dots between daily work (e.g., PRA and obtaining school records, and criminogenic case planning) and integration of education into overall recidivism reduction. It will also facilitate opportunities for feedback and alignment of the missions of the two agencies.

- Utilize diverse communication forums to disseminate EBP information (e.g., meetings, trainings, websites, and intranet, newsletters from leadership, emails, and memos). These forums can offer increased cross-agency and cross-facility learning opportunities where staff can learn from each other and brainstorm.

- Develop a communication plan that clearly identifies how JJS staff and teacher input is being heard. Consider incorporating a feedback loop that will create opportunities for staff to provide their ideas and see how those ideas are being used. Leadership should be clear on how the information will be used and provide feedback on how or if that information was applied. Asking for input from staff that is likely not to be considered can be frustrating for staff and can diminish the motivation of staff to collaborate and implement EBP.

- Once a communication plan has been implemented at each facility, leadership should provide opportunities for coaching staff on how to practice the communication skills.

6) *Purpose*

This area examines how staff from both agencies perceive their goals, objectives, and vision for collaboration and implementing EBP. This area includes the following two subscales: Concrete, Attainable Goals/Objectives and Shared Vision.

Concrete, Attainable Goals and Objectives

- Similar to the results in the *Process and Structure* section, staff from both agencies reported that their agency has clearly set goals and objectives. However, teachers are unclear on how their goals fit in with the JJS EBP mission and what their contribution is to reducing recidivism in terms of education being a criminogenic need.
- Also, when asked about whether staff think that others get confused about the goals of each agency, most staff agreed that there is confusion.

Shared Vision

- There is disagreement among teachers and JJS staff about the dedication to making collaboration and EBP implementation a part of the way "business is done" in each facility. It was reported that this could be due to the fact the teachers are not trained in criminal justice EBP.

Recommendations – Purpose

- Please see Recommendations from both the *Process and Structure and Communication* sections.

7) *Resources*

This area examines how staff view the resources available to them to be able to improve collaboration efforts. This area includes the following scale: Sufficient Funds, Staff, Materials and Time.

Sufficient Funds, Staff, Materials, and Time

- Staff from both agencies reported that funds can always be increased to help collaboration, trainings, or any other effort to be successful. Most staff said that they would be willing to participate in more collaboration efforts and trainings, regardless of funds, if the outcome was to help the youth they work with. However, not having enough time in the day to fit everything in was a concern for most staff from both agencies.
- JJS staff and teachers at most facilities reported that they have enough staff to meet the needs of youth and their agencies. However, JJS staff felt that more staff were needed to help monitor the classrooms.
- As mentioned in above sections, a primary resource has been the employment of the school ETCA at one of the facilities. Staffs at this facility continue to agree that this is a good use of funds in moving collaboration efforts forward.

Recommendations – Resources

- Understanding financial constraints, it is important to support staff by providing adequate and up-to-date training and resources to improve collaboration efforts. Explore where collaboration is successful and determine cost effective ways to implement similar practices in other facilities (e.g., collaboration committees or school ETCAs).
- In regards to trainings, it may be more cost-effective to provide in-service trainings instead of outsourcing. Survey the staff to see what skills they possess and if they are willing to train other staff. This is a great way to not only build collaboration among staff, but also to reduce the costs required for travel to other trainings.

Essential Areas for Collaboration and EBP Implementation Success Based on Focus Groups

To help guide the discussion surrounding improving the collaboration efforts and EBP implementation between the LEA and JJS staff in secure facilities, questions were asked during each focus group to identify the essential areas for success and to suggest approaches for developing an evidence-based system. Some of the key suggestions are highlighted in Table 7.

Table 7. Essential Areas for Successful Collaboration

Essential Areas for Successful Collaboration and EBP Implementation in Secure Facilities	• Better internal communication between teachers, JJS staff, and administrators • Continuing trust and respect for each other working in the same secure facility • Being more flexible and adaptable to new ideas and change • Incorporate EBP training for teachers to include PRA knowledge and criminogenic case planning; helping both agencies to "speak the same language" • Development of more formal communication practices among teachers and JJS staff • Development of shared behavior ratings for consistency inside and outside the classroom • Defining an appropriate level of involvement of teachers in intake and exit staffings and allowing for their input in the education domain of the PRA and the criminogenic case plan • Development of a shared vision and clear identification of roles and responsibilities as it relates to reducing recidivism • Development of more comprehensive communication resources/links (e.g., school ETCAs and/or school record access databases)

Conclusion

Both teachers and JJS staff defined collaboration as a way to exchange information between numerous agencies to help with problem solving, understanding youth's needs, and overall producing better outcomes. Collaboration efforts are intended to move systems away from traditional practices of power and towards a system that allows for shared authority. This results in greater achievements than would be attained by one agency working alone. Since no juvenile justice agency can operate in a vacuum, engaging system leaders and staff in collaboration efforts helps to eliminate barriers, increase opportunities for success, enrich the change process, and create a shared vision that supports the systemic EBP efforts is imperative.

Working collaboratively with both the USOE and JJS in the planning and implementation of EBP can result in a more coherent continuum of care for youth in secure care and one that uses evidence-based principles to reduce recidivism. By collaborating with each other, a comprehensive and integrated array of services that could not be provided by a single agency can be developed. The reduction of recidivism cannot fall on one agency alone; it must be shared by everyone. Clear identification of roles and responsibilities, strategic EBP training, and development of communication links will assist in creating a shared vision and ownership for truly becoming an evidence-based system.

Following a review of the findings of this retrospective evaluation report, the strategic planning process will begin. A continuous quality plan will be developed collaboratively with the USOE and JJS to determine areas where more EBP training can be shared between agency staff, where resources can be reallocated, and what technology can be developed to bridge the gap in communication links. In moving forward it will be important to maintain a realistic continuous quality improvement plan that allows for thorough and thoughtful implementation of new collaboration practices over a multi-year period.

References

Ameen, C. A., Loeffler-Cobia, J., Clawson, E., & Guevara, M. (2010). *Evidence-based practices skills assessment for criminal justice organizations.* Washington, DC: National Institute of Corrections.

Andrews, D., & Bonta, J. (Eds.). (2010). *The psychology of criminal conduct (5th Edition ed.).* New Providence, NJ: Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., LexisNexis Group.

Bordon, L. M., & Perkins, D. (1999). Assessing your collaboration: A self-assessment. *Journal of Extension, 37*, 2.

Carey, M. (2010). *A framework for evidence-based decision making in local criminal justice systems.* Washington, DC: National Institute of Corrections.

Crime and Justice Institute at Community Resources for Justice (2009). *Implementing evidence-based policy and practice in community corrections, 2nd ed.* Washington, DC: National Institute of Corrections.

Heiftetz, R. A., Grawshow, A., & Linksky, M. (2009). *The practice of adaptive leadership: Tools and tactics for changing your organization and the world*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.

Hogue, T., Perkins, D., Clark, R., Bergstrum, A., Slinski, M., & Associates (1995). *Collaboration framework: Addressing community capacity.* Columbus, OH: National Network for Collaboration.

Leone, P., Quinn, M. M., & Osher D. (2002). *Collaboration in the juvenile justice system and youth serving agencies: Improving prevention, providing more efficient services, and reducing recidivism for youth with disabilities.* Washington DC: American Institutes for Research. Retrieved on August 1, 2013 from: http://cecp.air.org/juvenilejustice/docs/Collaboration20in20the20Juvenile20Justice20System.pdf

Loeffler-Cobia, J., & Guevera, M. (2010). *Putting the pieces together: Practical strategies to implementing evidence-based practices.* Washington, DC: National Institute of Corrections.

Puzzanchera, C., Adams, B., & Hockenberry, S. (2012). *Juvenile Court Statistics Report.* Pittsburgh, PA: National Center for Juvenile Justice.

Sachwald, J., & Eley, E. (2008). The c-crets of collaboration. *Corrections Today, 70*(2)*, 38.*

Appendix A. Collaboration Best Practice Scope of Work

Collaboration and Evidence-Based Practice Scope of Work

Phase One: Evaluation Purpose and Process Development

Activity

Scope of Work Development

Literature Review on Education and Juvenile Justice Collaboration Best Practices

Meeting with USOE Administration to present Scope of Work and receive feedback

Meeting with UDJJS Administration to present Scope of Work and receive feedback

Meeting with Local Education Agency Administrators (5) and UDJJS Assistant Directors (9)

Workplan Management

Phase Two: Needs and Resources Assessment

Activity

Focus Group Category and Question Development

Documentation Checklist Development

Sampling of sites and participants and Logistics

Conduct Focus Groups/observations and Document Review

Phase Three: Strategic Planning

Activity

Goals and Planning: Report Development and Strategic Planning

Analysis of Focus Group Data

Analysis of Documentation

Develop Report

Strategic Planning Meeting Preparation

Strategic Planning Meeting to Present Report Findings and Prioritize

Phase Four: Capacity Building

Activity

Best Practice and Capacity Building

Best Practices: Training Development

Pilot Site Selection and Material Development

Best Practices: Training

2 day Trainings (4 trainings) 8 total days

Capacities: Training of Trainers

2 day Training (1 training)

Capacities and Sustainability: Capacity Development

Consultation on Standard Operating Procedure Development

Consultation on updates for Job Descriptions for Teachers

Consultation on updates for performance evaluations for Teachers

Appendix B. Collaboration Evidence-Based Practice Online Survey

Collaboration Evidence-Based Practices Online Survey
Consent Form

The purpose of this research project is to develop collaboration best practice efforts between the local UDJJS staff and school district's staff, each of which is serving the same incarcerated youth. This is a research project being conducted by the *Utah Criminal Justice Center (UCJC)* at the *University of Utah.*

You are invited to participate in this research project because you are either a staff member from JJS or a Local Education Agency (LEA) that works in a secure facility. Your participation in this research study is voluntary. You may choose not to participate. If you decide to participate in this research survey, you may withdraw at any time. If you decide not to participate in this study or if you withdraw from participating at any time, you will not be penalized. You can choose not to finish the online survey or omit any question you prefer not to answer without penalty or loss of benefits. We expect to have a total of about 200 participants from 5 different JJS facilities.

The online survey will take approximately 30 minutes to complete. Your responses will be confidential and we do not collect identifying information such as your name, email address, or IP address.

We will do our best to keep your information confidential. All data is stored in a password protected electronic format. To help protect your confidentiality, the surveys will not contain information that will personally identify you. The results of this study will be used for quality improvement purposes only and may be shared with representatives from both agencies.

If you have any questions about the research study, please contact Rob Butters, UCJC Director, at rob.butters@utah.edu or (801) 585-3246. This research has been reviewed according to University of Utah and Utah Division of Juvenile Justice Service's Institutional Review Board (IRB) procedures for research involving human subjects.

Contact the IRB if you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant. Also, contact the IRB if you have questions, complaints or concerns which you do not feel you can discuss with the investigator. The University of Utah IRB may be reached by phone at (801) 581-3655 or by e-mail at irb@hsc.utah.edu. Alternately, you can contact the Department of Human Services IRB, John DeWitt, Utah Division of Juvenile Justice, 801.538.4333.

Your experience and opinions are greatly appreciated. Thank you in advance for your participation.

Sincerely,
Utah Criminal Justice Center – University of Utah

ELECTRONIC CONSENT: Please select your choice below.
Clicking on the "agree" button below indicates that:
• you have read the above information
• you voluntarily agree to participate
• you are at least 18 years of age
If you do not wish to participate in the research study, please decline participation by clicking on the "disagree" button.

Definitions

1) **Collaboration:** is such a high level of partnering with another agency that both partners proactively seek to know and fully support the goals of the other agency and its staff.

2) **LEA -** is a Local Education Agency or School District

3) **Evidence-Based Practices:** are practices, protocols, processes and tools that are developed from research and corresponding experiences that aid in improving agencies' goals and outcomes such as improved education attainment, reduced recidivism, etc.

Collaboration Evidence-Based Practices Survey Instructions

This survey can help identify this facility's strengths on the factors that research has shown are important for the success of collaborative efforts and improve evidence-based practice sustainability. The survey is designed for use by people who are planning or participating in collaborative efforts.

There is no right or wrong answers. Your opinion is important, even if it is very different from the opinions of others. Results from the survey will be used to help identify areas of strengths and areas in need of improvement in your facility. Your answers will not be associated with your name and will be grouped with the answers of others.

Instructions

Please follow the instructions exactly.
1. Read each item.
2. Select the number that indicates how much you agree or disagree with each item.
3. If you feel **you don't know how to answer** an item or that you don't have an opinion, select the "neutral" response (#3) – **Don't Know.**
4. If you feel that **your opinion lies between two numbers,** select the *lower* of the two.   For example, if you feel that your opinion lies between 1 and 2, select 1.

Scale
1 = Strongly Disagree   2 = Disagree   3 = Neutral/No Opinion   4 = Agree   5 = Strongly Agree

---

Collaboration Evidence-Based Practice Survey Questions

Demographic Information	
1) **Gender**	**Male Female**
2) **Type of Position**	**Juvenile Justice Counselor I** **Juvenile Justice Counselor II** **Juvenile Justice Counselor III** **Case Manager** **Transition Advocate** **Juvenile Justice Supervisor** **LEA Administrator** **LEA Counselor** **LEA Teacher** **Other**
3) **How many years have you worked with high risk youth (either in JJS or as an educator)?**	**0-5** **6-10** **11-15** **16+**

Domains	Factors	Statements	SD	D	N	A	SA
Environment	*History of collaboration or cooperation in the Facility*	Agencies (e.g., education and juvenile justice) in our facility have a history of working very well together.	1	2	3	4	5
		Willingness to solve problems together through collaboration has been common in this facility. It's been done a lot before.	1	2	3	4	5
	Staffing collaborative team seen as a legitimate leader in the facility	JJS leaders in this facility seem supportive of collaboration efforts.	1	2	3	4	5
		LEA leaders in this facility seem supportive of collaboration efforts.	1	2	3	4	5
		Staff would generally agree that both organizations (JJS and School Districts) should be involved in collaboration efforts in our facility.	1	2	3	4	5
	Favorable political and social climate	The current political and social climate seems to be "right" for starting or improving our collaborative efforts between JJS staff and LEA's.	1	2	3	4	5
		The time is right for improved collaborative efforts.	1	2	3	4	5
		Collaborating with other agencies in this facility takes too much effort and is not necessary.	1	2	3	4	5

Utah Criminal Justice Center
College of Social Work
THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

Collaboration and Evidence-Based Practice
Retrospective Evaluation Summary Report

Membership characteristics	*Mutual respect understanding, and trust*	In general, staff involved in our facility trust one another.	1	2	3	4	5
		JJS staff involved in our facility trust LEA staff.	1	2	3	4	5
		LEA staff involved in our facility trust JJS staff.	1	2	3	4	5
		JJS and LEA leaders usually trust each other in our facility	1	2	3	4	5
		I have a lot of respect for both JJS and LEA staff in our facility.	1	2	3	4	5
	Appropriate cross section of members	When clients/students are being staffed (i.e., client/student staffing: identifying areas of need of clients/students) there is a good cross representation of those who have a stake in improving the services provided to our clients/students and achieving better youth outcomes.	1	2	3	4	5
		LEA staff are involved in the client/student staffing process at our facility.	1	2	3	4	5
	Members see collaboration as in their self-interest	I wish I had the opportunity to say more when clients/students are staffed.	1	2	3	4	5
		Our facility will benefit from being involved in collaboration efforts.	1	2	3	4	5
		I would personally benefit from being involved in collaboration efforts at our facility.	1	2	3	4	5

Utah Criminal Justice Center
College of Social Work
THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

Collaboration and Evidence-Based Practice
Retrospective Evaluation Summary Report

	Ability to compromise	LEA staff involved in client/student staffing are willing to compromise on important aspects of clients/students' educational treatment plans.	1	2	3	4	5
		JJS staff involved in client/student staffing are willing to compromise on important aspects of clients/students' educational treatment plans.	1	2	3	4	5
Process and Structure	*Members share a stake in both process and outcome*	Staff invests the right amount of time in collaborative efforts.	1	2	3	4	5
		It is important for all staff to have skills in implementing evidence-based practice.	1	2	3	4	5
		Staff in our facility want evidence-based practices to succeed.	1	2	3	4	5
		The level of commitment to implementing evidence-based practices among JJS staff is high.	1	2	3	4	5
		The level of commitment to implementing evidence-based practices among LEA staff is high.	1	2	3	4	5
		When JJS staff make major decisions that would affect the education environment, there is enough time for staff to comfortably adjust to the changes.	1	2	3	4	5

Multiple layers of Participation	When making decisions on educational client/student needs, LEA staff at this facility can speak for the entire agency or school that they represent.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Flexibility	There is a lot of flexibility when decisions that affect everyone are made at our facility; people are open to discussing different options.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
	People in this facility are open to different approaches to how we can do our work. They are willing to consider different ways of working.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
	JJS staff at this facility are able to adapt to changing conditions, such as fewer funds than expected, changing political climate, or change in leadership.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
	LEA staff at this facility are able to adapt to changing conditions, such as fewer funds than expected, changing political climate, or change in leadership.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
	LEA staff typically resist change.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
	JJS staff typically resist change.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Development of clear roles and policy guidelines	There is a clear process for making decisions among the agencies in this facility.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

Communication		People in this facility have a clear sense of their roles and responsibilities.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
	Adaptability	Staff members are open to trying new ideas, in order to improve evidence-based practices.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
		Learning and using new concepts, practices, and procedures are easy to implement in our facility.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
		I am sometimes too cautious or slow to make changes.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
	Open and frequent communication	People in our facility communicate openly with one another.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
		People in our facility appear to communicate openly with one another, but I often wonder about their motives.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
		I am informed as often as I should be about what goes on in this facility.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
		JJS leaders in our facility communicate well with all staff.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
		LEA leaders in our facility communicate well with all staff.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
		Communication among JJS and LEA staff regarding clients/students in our facility happens both at formal meetings and in informal ways (e.g., in between class changes).	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

Utah Criminal Justice Center
College of Social Work
THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

Collaboration and Evidence-Based Practice
Retrospective Evaluation Summary Report

		JJS staff share client/student education and behavioral goals with LEA staff.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
		LEA staff share client/student education and behavioral goals with JJS staff.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
	Established informal relationships and communication links	In our facility, I personally have informal conversations about evidence-based practices with staff <u>not</u> in my agency.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
		JJS and LEA agency leaders communicate well between each other in our facility.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Purpose	*Concrete, attainable goals and objectives*	Staff in our facility know and understand our agency's mission.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
		I have a clear understanding of how evidence-based practices reduce recidivism.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
		This facility has established clear and reasonable goals to achieve desired behavioral outcomes in our clients/students.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
		LEA and JJS staff in this facility are dedicated to the idea that we can make collaboration a part of the "way we do business."	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
	Shared vision	My ideas about how LEAs and JJS staff could improve collaboration seem to be the same as the ideas of others.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
		Working collaboratively together is difficult to start and sustain.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

Utah Criminal Justice Center
College of Social Work
THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

Collaboration and Evidence-Based Practice
Retrospective Evaluation Summary Report

Resources	*Sufficient funds, staff, materials, and time*	Our facility has adequate funds to improve our collaboration efforts.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
		Our facility has adequate "people power" or champions to make improved collaboration a priority.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
	Skilled leadership	The staff in leadership positions have good skills for working with other people and agencies.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Evidence-Based Practice Knowledge	*Evidence-Based Practice*	This facility incorporates a Risk Need Assessment to identify behavior areas the client/student needs to address.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
		This facility incorporates a case plan for each client/student that identifies the targeted goals related to the risk areas the client/student is to achieve.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
		Risk assessment information is shared with staff from both agencies (JJS and LEAs)	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
		Case plans are shared with staff from both agencies.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
		I have an understanding of cognitive behavioral techniques.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
		It is important to utilize behavior changing techniques both in the classroom and in our facility.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

Education as a criminogenic need	I have a general knowledge of what the criminogenic risk factors are for reducing recidivism.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
	I consider education a criminogenic risk factor.	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

Utah State Office of Education and Juvenile Justice Services

Collaboration Evidence-Based Practice

Focus Group Guide

Focus Group Introduction:

Good (morning or afternoon) and welcome to our session today. First of all we want to thank you for taking the time to join our discussion of Collaboration Evidence-Based Practices with the Local Education Agencies (LEA) and JJS. My name is Jennifer Loeffler-Cobia and I am a Senior Research Analyst for the University of Utah's Criminal Justice Center (UCJC). Along with me is Jennie Hall who is a Research Analyst for UCJC. As you may know already, the USOE and JJS have recently begun working with the UCJC to improve the collaboration efforts among both JJS and teachers in working together in secure facilities; overall working together to improve outcomes for the shared youth served. As part of this work UCJC is conducting a retrospective study to review current collaboration efforts among 5 juvenile justice sites. Through this process we want to be able to obtain important input from LEA teachers and JJS staff about how EBP has been implemented in your organization and how collaboration can be improved.   One of the ways to do this is to tap into your knowledge and expertise as those who conduct this work on a daily basis.

The goals of each focus group are to:
1. Identify strengths and gaps in collaboration efforts;
2. Document specific examples of collaboration within each site;
4. Elicit participants' opinions about how to improve the implementation of collaboration practices within each site.

You were selected and invited to participate using a random sample method (meaning that you all were selected without bias) and because you obtain the experience and knowledge necessary to provide us with the information that we are seeking.

Today we will be discussing your experience and opinions about collaboration efforts within you site. There are no right or wrong answers but rather differing experiences and perspectives. Please feel free to share your point of view even if it differs from what others have said.

Before we start, let me share some ground rules. This is strictly a research/evaluation project and the information shared in this focus group will be used only to further enhance the implementation of EBP and nothing else. Please speak up---but please let's try to only have one person talk at a time. We are tape recording the session because we don't want to miss any of your comments. If several are talking at the same time, the tape will get garbled and we will miss your important comments. The tape will not be shared with anyone other than UCJC staff and project consultants for analysis purposes and you will not be specifically identified to anyone. Similarly, although we encourage you to continue these discussions when you leave, we request that you extend the same level of confidentiality to each other. What we mean by this is that specific comments made by individuals should not be shared outside of this focus group.

We will be on first name basis today, and in our reports no names will be attached to comments. Everything will be in aggregate form and kept in strict confidence.   So again please feel free to speak up and comment freely. Keep in mind that we are just as interested in the strengths and weakness of collaboration efforts.

Our session will last about 2 hours so let's begin. We've place name cards on the table, so if you could please write your first name on the card so we can see it that would be great. Let's find out more about each other by going around the room one at a time. Please tell us your name, position/job, how long you have been in community corrections, and your favorite hobby or activity you enjoy doing.

Collaboration and Evidence-Based Practice
Retrospective Evaluation Summary Report

LEA Teachers and JJS Staff Focus Group

Category	Question	

Environment	History of Collaboration	• What is your understanding of the definition/meaning of collaboration in your facility?
		• Can you give me some examples of things that JJS and LEA collaborate on?
		    ○ Probing: Please explain how collaboration between JJS staff and Teachers has primarily taken place within your facility.
		• When there is a behavior problem while a youth is in school what is the primary protocol for problem solving?
		    ○ Probing: Is there an established protocol on site? If so, what is the protocol?

	Collaboration among leaders in the facility	• Who is the primary staff in your facility that should be involved in 1) leading collaboration efforts and 2) implementing collaboration efforts among JJS staff and teachers?
	Favorable Climate for Collaboration	• What type of climate/environment needs to be created for good collaboration to be effective and sustainable? ○ Based on the criteria listed where do you think your facility's strengths and areas of improvement are?
Membership Characteristics	Respect/Trust	• Are there any barriers among both agencies that would hinder JJS staff and Teachers from trusting one another? If so, what are these barriers?

	Cross Section of Members	• Who is represented at youth staffings?
		• Is there any type of staff/group/agency that is not present that should be? If so, who?
		    ○ In the beginning? If an incident happens? At discharge?
		    ○ What types of issues are addressed?

	Staff see benefits to Collaboration	• How are JJS staff utilized during youth staffings? • How are teachers utilized during youth staffings?
	Ability to Compromise	• Explain how treatment plans in regards to youth education needs are determined?
EBP Knowledge	• Explain how you gain an understanding of the client's needs when they enter your program? Where does that come from? ○ Do all staff know about these needs? • How is EBP information shared between JJS and Teachers (vice versa)? • What factors are important to target with these clients? • On a scale of 1-5 how important is education, in your opinion, for these clients in this program?	

Process and Structure	Members share a stake in process and outcome	• How are changes made in your facility?
		    o How are staff (both JJS and teachers) made aware of changes?
		• How much time do you spend collaborating with others?
		    o What is the commitment level to making EBP sustainable?
		• What do you see as a primary barrier to sustaining collaboration efforts in your facility?

	Participation	• How involved are teachers in the case planning on the Case Planning Tool (CPT) (Pertaining to education and collaborative information for other criminogenic needs).
	Flexibility	How do JJS staff and teachers share ideas? When changes are made what is the response from staff?
	Clear roles and responsibility	Explain your role in the development in treatment plans for youth?
Communication	Open and Frequent Communication	• How does your facility communicate the needs of youth (e.g., send, receive and share information)? • Probes: Current process of communication? (i.e. direction/flow/planning) Is the communication primarily within your own facility or is there a sharing process of communication between sites (the organization as a whole)? (i.e., send receive, and share EBP information)? • Who communicates change efforts to you?
Purpose	Shared Vision	• Can you tell me what you know about evidence-based practices? • Describe for me the behavioral outcomes you hope to see in clients.
	Shared Goals	• What programs or practices and goals do you have to help them attain those outcomes? • What are the difficulties with collaboration?
Resources	• Where are the resources disseminated in your facility? • How much effort do you see going towards EBP in your facility? • Would you be willing to be part of more collaboration efforts?	
Lessons and Recommendations (Summary Question)	• What have been the most significant successes, challenges and barriers you have experienced in collaborating within your facility? • What are your recommendations for moving forward with EBP?	

THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

Utah Criminal Justice Center

COLLEGE OF SOCIAL WORK
COLLEGE OF SOCIAL & BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES
UTAH COMMISSION ON CRIMINAL & JUVENILE JUSTICE
S.J. QUINNEY COLLEGE OF LAW