

Implementing Results-Based Accountability™ in the Juvenile Justice System

Submitted pursuant to Public Act 14-217

Presented to:

The Tow Youth Justice Institute

University of New Haven

Developed by:

The Charter Oak Group, LLC

DRAFT: March 3, 2016

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
Acknowledgements.....	3
Introduction and Overview	4
How is RBA Different?	5
Population Level RBA Model: Result Statement and Primary Indicators	6
Secondary Indicators.....	7
Indicator Data Development Agenda.....	7
Operational Definitions of Primary Indicators	8
Service Cluster Definitions and Common Performance Measurements:.....	9
Operational Definitions of Key Common Performance Measures	16
System Performance Measures	20
Operational Definitions of System Performance Measures.....	22
Using RBA for Managing and Improving Programs	25
Using RBA in Performance Contracting.....	26
Recommendations for Implementation and Next Steps.....	30
References	32
Appendix A: Sample Program Report Card	Error! Bookmark not defined.

Acknowledgements

Ronald Schack, Ph.D., of the Charter Oak Group, LLC was the principal author of this implementation plan. The team at the Tow Youth Justice Institute: William Carbone, Catherine Tyrol, Jeanne Milstein were instrumental in the development of this plan, as was Catherine Foley-Geib of the Court Support Services Division, CT Judicial Branch.

The support of the co-chairs of the Juvenile Justice Policy Oversight Committee, Representative Toni Walker and Secretary Benjamin Barnes, as well as the other members of the JJPOC, was critical in the development of this report.

An advisory group of system partners provided invaluable guidance, insight and feedback. These include:

Brian Hill, Court Support Services Division, CT Judicial Branch

Anne MacIntyre Lahner, Department of Children and Families

Deborah Fuller, Court Support Services Division, CT Judicial Branch

Erica Bromley, CT Youth Services Association

Patrick Hynes, CT Department of Corrections

John Frasinelli, CT State Department of Education

Hector Glynn, The Village For Children and Families

Linda Dixon, Department of Children and Families

Maureen Price-Borland, Community Partners For Action

Introduction and Overview

This report is intended to provide guidance to partners in the Juvenile Justice System in applying Results-Based Accountability™¹ to the Juvenile Justice system, its organizations and programs. Public Act 14-217 requires the use of the RBA by the Juvenile Justice System, and this document constitutes a plan for implementing RBA throughout the JJ System.

During the Raise The Age (RTA) effort, the Juvenile Justice Policy and Operations Coordinating Council (JJPOCC) used RBA to develop recommendations for services associated with the RTA effort. The Charter Oak Group, LLC, under contract to The Justice Education Center, Inc., assisted in the development of a services model and a working RBA model for this work.

In assisting the new JJPOC in implementing Public Law 14-217, the Tow Youth Justice Institute contracted with The Charter Oak Group, LLC to develop an RBA implementation plan; validating and enhancing the prior work of the JJPOCC services committee. A small advisory group was formed with representatives from the CT Judicial Branch, the CT Department of Children and Families, the CT Department of Corrections, The CT State Department of Education, as well as community providers and advocacy groups. The RBA model contained in this implementation plan is the result of this groups efforts to validate and enhance the prior services model and tentative RBA framework.

This document is intended as:

1. An RBA implementation plan for the system, and each partner within the system
2. An articulation of the “population level” model under which all system services and programs should be aligned
3. A set of operationalized common system and program performance measures, which will allow for the roll up of certain common performance measures (like recidivism) to the system level, as well as to provide some standardization to allow for peer benchmarking and comparisons across programs.
4. Guidance for the use of performance measures for management and program improvement
5. Guidance for the use of RBA in performance contracting and
6. A general framework for applying RBA throughout the system.

¹ Please note that while the term “Results-Based Accountability” is trademarked, the creator of RBA, Mark Friedman, allows its use for free in the public and non-profit sectors. Also, most of the concepts embedded in RBA are long-standing performance management concepts, so whether the term RBA is used or not, applying these concepts to the juvenile justice system is appropriate and critical to the sustained success of the system.

How is RBA Different?

Results-based Accountability (RBA) is an accountability framework, which emphasizes starting with the results or quality of life conditions we are trying to achieve and working backwards to specifying the means by which we accomplish those results. RBA also emphasizes using data drive decision making.

RBA emphasizes the distinction between **population accountability** and **performance accountability**. At the population level, we are concerned with the well- being of whole populations (such as all youth in the state of Connecticut) and the results or quality of life conditions we want for them. This is very different from the performance level, where we are concerned with the well- being of client populations to whom we are providing specific services. This distinction is important, because it allows us to measure success at two levels, to show how services and programs contribute to population level results, and assign appropriate responsibility to programs through the use of appropriate performance measures.

At the population level, we measure the extent to which we are achieving results for whole populations by using indicators. Indicators are high level measures of success for community/state/nation/world; no one organization or agency or even sector can be held solely responsible for success on a population level indicator. Such indicators—like the percentage of all youth that are justice involved—are only improved through the collective efforts of many partners in the community.

Through our political process, we determine what kinds of programs or services might best contribute to improving (or “turning the curve”) on one or more of these indicators. Once such a service or program is implemented, and services are provided to participants, then we move to the performance accountability level. All such programs and services (or even whole organizations or service delivery systems) can be measured through three basic types of performance measures:

- **How much did we do?**
- **How well did we do it?**
- **Is Anyone Better Off?**

These measures can be used to determine whether anyone was better off after services were provided, whether the service was provided well (was the process efficient, timely, responsive, sufficiently compelling for clients to return to the program or complete the program, etc.) and what the scope or reach of the program or service is. Similar to the population level indicators, these measures can be examined to determine how they can be improved, and what partners may play a role in this improvement process.

RBA, then, provides the basic measurement structure both across partners and for each partner providing specific services; it also allows the alignment of services underneath the broad population results that we are trying to achieve. The performance measures themselves should be familiar; RBA did

not invent performance measurement or improvement processes, but the simplified use of language and the application of language discipline helps everyone to speak the same language as we try to improve our programs and achieve the results we want for our youth.

Population Level RBA Model: Result Statement and Primary Indicators

The following results statement serves as a positive statement of the ideal quality of life conditions we want for ALL YOUTH. The juvenile justice system is one of several systems that contribute to these quality of life conditions.²

Results Statement: All Connecticut's youth grow up in stable environments, safe, healthy, and ready to lead successful lives.

The following primary indicators are population level measures of the extent to which we are achieving the above quality of life conditions for our youth. By understanding the story behind the actual performance on this indicators, we can collectively develop strategies to improve.

Primary Indicators³:

- **% youth that are justice involved**
 - **% youth referred to court for delinquency/criminal charges**
 - **% youth referred to court—FSWN**
 - **% youth incarcerated**
 - **% of youth diverted from justice involvement**
- **% of justice-involved youth that recidivate**
- **% youth that are employed**
- **% youth that graduate from high school**
- **% youth that attend school regularly (are not chronically absent)**
- **% youth that have no school disciplinary incidents**
- **CDC Youth Risk Behavior wellness index**
- **School Based Arrest Rate**

Please note that all of these indicators can and should be disaggregated as appropriate (by age, by race/ethnicity, by geography, etc).

² This result statement is based upon the CT Children’s Report Card results statement, which has been adopted by several agencies and provider networks.

³ Traditionally, several of these indicators are reported in the negative (justice involvement, recidivism, unemployment, chronic absenteeism, and school discipline), but we feel it is important to take a strength based approach and operationalize these as positive when it is practical and not too confusing to do so.

Secondary Indicators

In RBA, secondary indicators are other important indicators that can provide insight into turning the curve on the primary indicators, or additional information on different quality of life conditions. **Please note there are many other possible secondary indicators; these are just a sample. As the primary indicators are analyzed, any other good, secondary indicator data can be used to understand and diagnose the primary indicators.**

- Youth Crime Rate (disaggregated by type of crime, age)
- Rate of substantiated abuse and neglect
- % youth meeting goal on physical fitness tests
- % single parent families
- % youth moving at least once in the past year

Indicator Data Development Agenda

- access to medical services (includes preventative treatment)
- number and percentage of youth that are diverted (to a JRB or other diversion program) prior to court referral, and the number and percentage of youth that are diverted post court referral

Operational Definitions of Primary Indicators

Indicator Name	Indicator Calculation	Data Sources	Technical Issues
% of Youth That Are Justice Involved	Number of youth referred to court, on probation or incarcerated during report period / Number of youth 0-17 in state	CT Judicial Branch; US Census Bureau ACS Population Estimates	
% of Youth Graduating On Time	Number of Youth starting HS in 9 th grade in public high schools in CT/Number of Youth Graduating HS 4 Years later (now standard measure)	CT State Department of Education	
% Youth attending school regularly	Number of youth NOT absent more than 10 days per year /number of youth attending school	CT State Department of Education	Some variation in the way school districts “count” absences
% of youth with no disciplinary incidents	Number of youth without any disciplinary incidents during school year/number of youth attending school	CT State Department of Education	Should be disaggregated by in/out of school suspension and detention
% of youth employed	Number of youth 16-19 looking for work who are employed/total number of youth looking for work	Bureau of Labor Statistics, American Community Survey	Should be reported with participation rate (percent of youth in age category that are looking for work)
Youth recidivism rate, 24 months	New criminal activity (arrest) by a juvenile offender after a specified point in the system (e.g., conviction, DCF commitment, probation, discharge, transfer to adult system, etc)		Please note that this definition is intended to be consistent with the recidivism rate definition(s) recommended by the JJPOC recidivism workgroup.
CDC Youth Behavior Wellness Index	Index of responses to questions on CDC YRBS regarding drug use, depression and suicide	Center For Disease Control Youth Risk Behavior Survey	
School Based Arrest Rate	% of students with a school based arrest	School District Data	

Service Cluster Definitions and Common Performance Measurements:

Prevention Services: any service or program specifically intended to help participants to develop behaviors that are likely to help them avoid justice involvement. These programs should be **strength based** and include community and family engagement approaches where appropriate. This includes programs that are intended to help youth attend and stay in school, develop leadership and teamwork abilities, provide youth with positive role models or mentors, or avoid negative behaviors (such as anti-substance abuse programs, anger management programs, or anti-bullying programs).

Common performance measures for these services include the following (some only apply to some programs) an asterisk is used to designate “where appropriate” *:

How Much

- Number of unique customers served, by type of customer
- Number of services provided, by type of service
- Number of unique customer receiving services, by type of customer

How Well

- % participants receiving services that complete prevention programs
- % participants using services multiple times*
- % of participants receiving services with a family component
- % of participants receiving services with a community engagement component
- % of participants reporting trusting program staff
- % of participants reporting that they had a program staff person they felt like it could talk to
- % of participants reporting feeling safe while participating in a program

Better Off

- % participants receiving services that remain free of justice involvement
- Average change in self-esteem and resiliency scores, pre-post*
- % participants receiving services that remain in school *
- % participants receiving services that are chronically absent (after participation)*
- % participants demonstrating knowledge and understand of leadership/teamwork*
- % of participating demonstrating and increase in pro-social behavior
- % participants demonstrating reduction of risk behavior*
- % of participants graduating from HS or earning GED*
- % of participants entering employment*
- % of participants enrolling in post-secondary training*

- % of students reporting their school climate has improved

Cost measures, including marginal cost, cost-benefit, and return on investment, such as those developed through the Results-First process, are also important and should be applied as appropriate. Please note that the Results-First approach is consistent with and complementary to the Results-Based Accountability (RBA) Framework; they should not be considered competing frameworks or that one should be adopted over the other.

There are several on-going initiatives at the state and community level intended to improve school climate. The outcome measure related to school climate listed above is one way to measure improvements in school climate; some of the initiatives may have additional measures intended to capture such improvements; the measure listed above is not intended to replace those other measures, but is intended as a placeholder for any outcome measures related to school climate change efforts.

Where appropriate, these indicators can be disaggregated to determine relative rates of service by minority group.

Diversion Services: any service or program specifically intended to divert participants from court involvement, when participants have been arrested or have been at the point of arrest. This includes Juvenile Review Boards and similar programs, as well as services that are provided in other environments that are specifically intended to reduce arrest and/or court involvement. These programs should be **strength based** and follow a **restorative justice**⁴ model. Where appropriate, these programs should include a family and community engagement component.

Common performance measures for these services include the following (some only apply to some programs) an asterisk is used to designate “where appropriate” *:

How Much

- Number of unique customers served, by type of customer
- Number of services provided, by type of service
- Number of unique customer receiving services, by type of customer

How Well

- % of participants completing the program
- % of participants reporting feeling like they have been treated fairly
- % of participants referred to other community services
 - % of those referred to other community services that actually receive service
 - % of those that a referred that have a positive outcome (see Better Off measures below).
- % of participants receiving services with a family component
- % of participants receiving services with a community engagement component.

Better Off:

- % of participants that avoid justice involvement or further justice involvement
- % of participants reporting they are better able to manage school, home and community (both from parent and youth perspective)
- Average change in self-esteem and resiliency scores, pre-post

Some diversion program may also have specific goals for participants regarding attendance in school, employment, or reduction of specific negative behaviors like substance abuse or school disciplinary incidents. If so, the following measure might apply to them as well:

⁴ Predominately restorative justice is used for the victim, specifically with a kind of mediation and/or restitution from the offender. Restorative justice is based on bringing together the victim, the offender, and the community; all have equal parts in repairing the relationships destroyed by crime. Generally the offender is held accountable to the victim for the criminal action and accountable as well to the community. The underlying premise of restorative justice holds that all three are accountable to each other.

- % participants receiving services that remain in school *
- % of participants reducing the number of school disciplinary incidents*
- % participants receiving services that are chronically absent (after participation)*
- % participants demonstrating reduction of negative behavior*
- % of participants graduating from HS or earning GED*
- % of participants entering employment*
- % of participants enrolling in post-secondary training*

Cost measures, including marginal cost, cost-benefit, and return on investment, such as those developed through the Results-First process, are also important and should be applied as appropriate. Please note that the Results-First approach is consistent with and complementary to the Results-Based Accountability (RBA) Framework; they should not be considered competing frameworks or that one should be adopted over the other.

School-based diversion initiatives (SBDI) are initiatives that are intended to reduce school based arrest rates and to develop alternatives to using arrest as a means of dealing with behavior problems that occur in the school setting. The success of these SBDI initiatives may be measured by the array of outcome measures listed above, where these approaches have been utilized with individual students; another important measure of SBDI would be the school based arrest rate.

Where appropriate, these indicators can be disaggregated to determine relative rates of service by minority group.

Intervention/Treatment Programs: any service provided to a justice involved youth that is intended to either reduce risk factors associated with justice involvement or to change the participant’s behavior, or to improve the participant’s mental and behavioral well-being, with the goal of reducing the participants’ likelihood of further justice involvement and improving the participants’ likelihood of success in school and life. These programs should be **strength based** and follow a **restorative justice** model. Where appropriate, services should include a family and community engagement component.

Common performance measures for these services include the following (some only apply to some programs) an asterisk is used to designate “where appropriate” *

How Much

- Number of unique customers served, by type of customer
- Number of services provided, by type of service
- Number of unique customer receiving services, by type of customer

How Well Measures:

- % completing the program
- % attending the program regularly*
- % of programs meeting evidence-based practice fidelity to model standards*
- % of participants receiving services that include a family component
- % of participants receiving services that include a community engagement component

Better Off Measures:

- % of participants avoiding further justice involvement
- % of participants improving their risk assessment score*
- % of participants improving the score on a behavioral health assessment*
- Average change in self-esteem/resiliency scores, pre-post*

Some of these programs may have other, specific intended goals for participants, like reduced substance abuse, employment, returning to school/better school attendance, etc. For services that have such goals, the following better off measures would also apply:

- % of participants reducing or ending their substance abuse behavior
- % participants receiving services that remain in school *
- % of participants reducing the number of school disciplinary incidents?
- % of participants that return to school*
- % participants receiving services that are chronically absent (after participation)
- % of participants graduating from HS or receiving a GED
- % of participants employed

- % of participants enrolling in post secondary education or training

Cost measures, including marginal cost, cost-benefit, and return on investment, such as those developed through the Results-First process, are also important and should be applied as appropriate. *Please note that the Results-First approach is consistent with and complementary to the Results-Based Accountability (RBA) Framework; they should not be considered competing frameworks or that one should be adopted over the other.*

Where appropriate, these indicators can be disaggregated to determine relative rates of service by minority group.

Re-entry Services: any service provided to a justice involved youth intended to help the youth successfully re-enter the community after intervention (probation, service in the community, confinement, etc). These programs should be **strength based** and follow a **restorative justice** model. Where appropriate, these services should include family and community engagement components.

Common performance measures for these services include the following (some only apply to some programs), an asterisk is used to designate “where appropriate” *

How Much

- Number of unique customers served, by type of customer
- Number of services provided, by type of service
- Number of unique customer receiving services, by type of customer

How Well:

- % of re-entering youth that comply with program rules
- % of re-entering youth that complete the re-entry program
- % of re-entering youth that are employed during participation
- % of re-entering youth that attend school 90% of the time*
- % of re-entering youth in stable housing while they are in the program*
- % of re-entering youth that do not get arrested
- % of participants receiving services with a family component
- % of participants receiving services with a community engagement component

Better Off

- % of re-entering youth that avoid further justice involvement
- % of re-entering youth that graduate HS or obtain a GED*
- % of re-entering youth that are employed at program completion*
- % of re-entering youth that are enrolled in post secondary training/education
- % of re-entering youth that have saved money during re-entry program*
- % of re-entering youth in stable housing

Cost measures, including marginal cost, cost-benefit, and return on investment, such as those developed through the Results-First process, are also important and should be applied as appropriate. Please note that the Results-First approach is consistent with and complementary to the Results-Based Accountability (RBA) Framework; they should not be considered competing frameworks or that one should be adopted over the other.

Where appropriate, these indicators can be disaggregated to determine relative rates of service by minority group.

Operational Definitions of Key Common Performance Measures

Performance Measure	Calculation	Data Source	Technical Notes
How Well Measures			
Program Completion Rate	Number of participants beginning services/Number of participants completing program	Varies by program or service	Completion should be defined as active participation through all phases of the service or program and meeting all essential program requirements
% Participants Receiving Services that are evidence based and meet fidelity to model standards	Number of participants receiving evidence based services that meet fidelity to model standards/number of participants that receive evidence based services with fidelity to model standards	Varies by program or service	
Unit cost per service	Total dollars expended on service /number of services provided	Program records	Sometimes services provided might be the same as individuals served; other times individuals may receive multiple services Use caution when making comparison with other programs or services using this measure; costs may vary significantly due to nature of program and characteristics of program participants
Overall Customer satisfaction	Number of survey respondents indicating they are very satisfied with services provided	Customer survey data	Survey could collect data on overall satisfaction, staff responsiveness, utility of services, and fairness of process and staff

Performance Measure How Well	Calculation	Data Source	Technical Notes
Percent of participants receiving services with a family component	Number of participants receiving services with a family component/ total number of participants	Program records	
Percent of participants reporting their school climate has improved	Number of participants reporting that their school climate has improved/total number of in-school participants	Program survey; possibly SDE survey	This may be more appropriate at the system level
Percent of participants receiving services with a community engagement component	Number of participants receiving services with a community engagement component / total number of program participants		
Percent of participants reporting they trusted program staff	Number of participants reporting they trusted program staff/ total number of participants	Program survey	
Percent of participants reporting they felt safe during program participation	Number of participants reporting they felt safe during program participation/total number of participants	Program survey	
Percent of participants reporting there was a staff person they could talk to during program participation	Number of participants reporting there was a staff person they could talk to during program participation/total number of participants	Program survey	

Performance Measure	Calculation	Data Sources	Technical Notes
Better Off Measures			
Recidivism Rate	New criminal activity (arrest) by a juvenile offender after a specified point in the system (e.g., conviction, DCF commitment, probation, discharge, transfer to adult system, etc)		This is intended to be consistent with the JJPOC Recidivism workgroup's recommendations regarding the definition of recidivism.
% participants avoid court involvement	Number of participants avoiding court	Program records CT Judicial Branch	For diversion programs

during and follow participation	involvement for 12 months following participation/Number of participants in cohort		
% of participants demonstrating improvement on risk assessment	Number of participants demonstrating improvement on risk assessment/Number of participants taking risk assessment	Program records	Improvement should be defined as X number of points on assessment
% of participants demonstrating improvement on mental health assessment	Number of participants demonstrating improvement on risk assessment/Number of participants taking risk assessment	Program records	
Average change in pre-post self-esteem and resiliency scores	Average change in self-esteem and resiliency scores, on pre-post survey	Program survey	
% of participants entering employment following participation	Number of participants entering employment following participation/number of participants in cohort	Program Records UI Wage Record Files	Could apply to all service categories
% of participants staying in school/reentering school after participation	Number of school age participants staying in school or returning to school/number of school age participants	Program records State Department of Education	Could apply to all service categories
% of participants graduating from HS or getting GED during or following participation	Number of participants graduating from HS or getting GED during or following participation/number of participants in cohort	Program records State Department of Education	Could apply to all service categories
% of participants enrolling in post-secondary training during or following participation	Number of participants enrolling in post secondary training during or following participation/number of participants ready for post secondary training enrollment	Program Records CT Board of Regents Records	Could apply to all service categories

Performance Measure	Calculation	Data Sources	Technical Notes
Better Off Measures			
% of participants saving money during participation	Number of participants saving at least \$100 during participation/number of participants in cohort	Program Records	For re-entry programs Could have different thresholds for dollar amount saved
% of participants that are not chronically absent from school following participation	Number of participants that are absent less than 10 days during school year/Number of participants in school	Program Records CT State Department of Education	Could apply to all service categories
% of participants not having any school disciplinary incidents following participation	Number of participants not having any school disciplinary incidents following participation/number of in school participants	Program records CT State Department of Education	Could apply to all service categories
Rate of post participation conviction and incarceration	Number of justice involved juveniles that receive treatment that are convicted and incarcerated following treatment		For all treatment programs

Please note that these measures will be disaggregated by age, race, gender and geography. This will also allow for disproportionate minority contact analysis.

System Performance Measures

There are two primary categories of system performance measures: 1) aggregations or “roll-ups” of common program performance measures (e.g. the percentage of participants in all re-entry programs that recidivate—as opposed to the percentage of participants in one re-entry program that recidivate) and 2) other measures of the system as a whole, such as the return on investment on system dollars expended. The Results-First initiative should provide an array of system performance measures related to cost, and such measures can be placed in this section once they are fully defined/operationalized.

System measures are an important way the JJPOC can monitor the system’s progress toward the three recently adopted goals:

- increase the rate of youth diverted from the system by 20%
- decrease the rate of youth incarcerated by 30%
- decrease the juvenile recidivism rate by 10%

These three goals, and the cross-program strategies that are intended to help achieve them, are reflected in all three measurement levels—the population indicators, the system performance measures, and the common program measures (see table below). System performance measures will be particularly valuable in assessing progress toward these goals.

	JJPOC Goals		
	Increase the rate of youth diverted from the juvenile justice system by 20%	Decrease the rate of youth incarcerated by 30%	Decrease the juvenile recidivism rate by 10%
Population Indicators	Youth Justice Involvement Rate	Youth Incarceration Rate	Youth Recidivism Rate (for all youth referred to court)
System Performance Measures	% of diversion program participants completing diversion programs	% of all youth referred to court that are incarcerated	% of all youth under supervision that recidivate at 3, 6, 12 and 24 months
Common Program Measures	% of diversion program participants that achieve expected outcomes (improve attendance, graduate from HS, enter employment)	% incarcerated after receiving services, by service cluster; average length of stay, disaggregated by race, ethnicity and socio-economic status	% of those referred to court receiving assessment; Outcomes for those receiving services (school attendance, HS graduation, employment, stable housing)

The following are system performance measures by each service category, and some that apply across categories.

Prevention

- For all those receiving prevention services, number and percent of referrals to juvenile court (across the population)
- Number and percent of all youth participating in prevention programs

Diversion

- Number and Percent of those being re-referred to juvenile court for individuals who have participated in diversion programs
- School-based arrest rate (for diversion initiatives aimed at families)
- For all those in diversion programs, rate of arrest for participants of services programs (for diversion services aimed at adults) Number and percent of all youth participating in diversion programs

Incarceration

- Number and percent of youth incarcerated
- Number and percent of youth re-arrested/reconvicted at 6,12,24 months following end of period of incarceration

Treatment

- For all those receiving treatment services, recidivism rate for juvenile and criminal systems

Reentry

- Recidivism Rate for juvenile and criminal systems
- Rate of participation in an education or employment program for individuals who reenter the community
- On time graduation rate

Across all program clusters

- Number and percent of youth receiving justice system services that improve educational outcomes (better attendance, better grades, graduation from HS, fewer disciplinary incidents)
- Return on Investment per system dollar expended; across all program clusters and disaggregated for prevention, diversion, intervention, incarceration, and re-entry components

Data Development Agenda

Overall, the system should also create measures that examine the extent to which both *procedural*⁵ and *restorative* justice are being achieved.

Operational Definitions of System Performance Measures

Measure	Calculation	Technical Notes
Prevention		
For all those receiving prevention services, number and percent of referrals to juvenile court (across the population)	Number of prevention clients receiving referrals to juvenile court / number of clients receiving prevention services	
Number and percent of all youth participating in prevention programs	Number of youth participating in prevention programs / number of youth 10-17	
Diversion		
Number and Percent of those being re-referred to juvenile court for individuals who have participated in diversion programs	Number of youth participating in diversion programs / number of youth 10-17	

⁵ Procedural justice (sometimes called procedural fairness) describes the idea that how individuals regard the justice system is tied more to the perceived fairness of the *process* and how they were treated rather than to the perceived fairness of the *outcome*. In other words, even someone who receives a traffic ticket or “loses” his case in court will rate the system favorably if he feels that the outcome is arrived at fairly.

Leading researchers on this topic, including Professor Tom Tyler of Yale Law School, have identified several critical dimensions of procedural fairness: (1) *voice* (the perception that your side of the story has been heard); (2) *respect* (perception that system players treat you with dignity and respect); (3) *neutrality* (perception that the decision-making process is unbiased and trustworthy); (4) *understanding* (comprehension of the process and how decisions are made); and (5) *helpfulness* (perception that system players are interested in your personal situation to the extent that the law allows).

Measure	Calculation	Technical Notes
School-based arrest rate (for diversion initiatives aimed at families)	Number of youth participating in school based diversion programs that are arrested in school / number of youth participating in school based diversion programs	
For all those in diversion programs, rate of arrest for participants of services programs (for diversion services aimed at adults) Number and percent of all youth participating in diversion programs	Number of customers participating in services that have a diversion components that are arrested / number participating in services that have a diversion component	
Incarceration		
Number and percent of youth incarcerated post court referral	Number of youth referred to court that are incarcerated (pre-trial or post conviction) /Number of youth referred to court	
Number and percent of youth re-arrested/reconvicted at 6,12,24 months following end of period of incarceration	Number of youth incarcerated post court referral that are re-arrested/reconvicted at 6,12, 24 months following end of period of incarceration	
Treatment		
For all those receiving treatment services, recidivism rate for juvenile and criminal systems	Number of youth receiving treatment/intervention services that are re-arrested/reconvicted at 6.12.24 months following start of services /Number of youth receiving treatment/intervention	

Measure	Calculation	Technical Notes
Reentry		
Recidivism Rate for juvenile and criminal systems	Number of youth re-entering the community that are re-arrested/reconvicted at 6.12.24 months following start of services /Number of youth re-entering the community	
Rate of participation in an education or employment program for individuals who reenter the community	Number of youth re-entering the community that participate in an education or employment program / number of youth re-entering the community	
On time graduation rate	Number of youth re-entering the community that graduate HS on time /Number of youth re-entering the community	
Across all program clusters		
Number and percent of youth receiving justice system services that improve educational outcomes (better attendance, better grades, graduation from HS, fewer disciplinary incidents)	Number of youth receiving justice system services that improve educational outcomes /number of youth receiving justice system services	
Return on Investment per system dollar expended; across all program clusters and disaggregated for prevention, diversion, intervention, incarceration, and re-entry components	Ratio of Dollars Generated/Saved to Dollars Expended, calculated across all program clusters, and for each cluster (prevention, diversion, intervention, incarceration, and re-entry) separately	Intended to be consistent with the cost measures used in the Results-First Initiative

Please note that these measures will be disaggregated by age, race, gender and geography. This will also allow for disproportionate minority contact analysis.

Using RBA for Managing and Improving Programs

RBA is first and foremost an accountability framework, one that allows organizations to align the services they provide with the results the state or community is trying to achieve for its residents. Population level indicators allow us to see how we collectively are achieving these results. At this collective, strategic level we can examine performance on these indicators and develop strategies to improve those indicators.

Once strategies are developed, and programs and services designed, we move to performance accountability, where we can check whether the programs and services we have funded are actually making a difference, that is, making people better off. The performance measures we specify for a program...how much we do, how well we do it, and whether anyone is better off can be reported to stakeholders to fulfill this aspect of accountability. But we can also use these measures, both at a system level and at an organizational level, to **manage and improve** our programs. If we choose how well measures, and certain better off measures, that are predictive of how we will perform on our ultimate better off measures, we can create management reports that can help us improve services in as close to real time as possible.

For any program or service, this process starts with the seven accountability questions we pose at the performance accountability level:

1. Who are the customers of this program or service?
2. How would we measure whether anyone was better off after receiving this service?
3. How would we measure how well we are providing this service?
4. How are we doing on the most important of these measures?
5. Who are the partners with a roll to play in doing better?
6. What works, what could work to do better?
7. What do we propose to do?

IF each time a management report that contains the most important how well and better off measures is reviewed, these questions are asked, the management reports can become a guide for improvement actions, as well as potential requests for programmatic changes and even changes in funding levels.

As a system, and as individual organizations, identifying these performance measures, regularly reporting and reviewing them, and attempting to “turn the curve” the most important of these measures should be built into our management and evaluation processes.

Using RBA in Performance Contracting

Elements of Performance Based Contracting:

- Development of RFP and Selection of Service Providers
- Contract Development
- Contract Management
- Payment and Contract Renewal

Development of RFP and Selection of Service Providers

- **Align** requested activities and services with the program's intent and with the system strategies, and population level quality of life result and indicators.
- **Specify which RBA common performance measures** will be used in the contact management process.
- **Require discussion of linkages to other partner services**, as appropriate, in terms of the coordination, calibration or integration of proposed services' contribution to the quality of life result at the population level.
- **Invite prospective service providers to join in a partnership around program improvement**
- **Ensure that evaluation criteria reflect RBA model elements.**

Contract Development

- **Develop a clear scope of work** that explicitly links services to be provided with expected customer outcomes
- **Specify what** services are to be provided and, if appropriate, **how** the services should be provided (best or promising practices)
- **Specify performance measures** to be used across all contracts. In addition to common program measures, include measures specific to any requirements for how services are delivered and what outcomes are most important.
- **Review expectations** with vendor, specifically including vendor reporting requirements, collaborative efforts at program improvement, contract monitoring approach, and criteria for contract renewal.

- **Build in** an emphasis on improvement and a progressive/incremental response to poor performance with the vendor creating a improvement methodology in partnership with the contractor

Contract Management

- **Clearly articulate** the approach to compliance, fiscal, and performance monitoring.
- **Emphasize desk review** for performance monitoring, including use of common performance measures from RBA model. Be sure measures used include how well measures and proxy outcomes that are early predictors of ultimate performance.
- **Calibrate** contract management efforts to the scope and importance of contract. The larger the contract, or the more critical, the more intense the performance monitoring should be. Comprehensive performance monitoring includes a mix of desk review, in person inspection, and case sample approaches.

Key Issue: Common Data Elements, Data Collection, and Data Systems

- Using performance measures always implies using the basic building blocks of RBA....
- When applied to vendors, this means that there need to be common technical data definitions, and a single specified data collection approach
- The question of data systems (one or many) also comes into play

Key Issue: Timing of Better Off (Outcome) Measures

- Better off (outcome)measures may have to be an intermediate or proxy for the actual outcome since so many outcomes are not reportable in the usual contract timeframe
- Sometimes a balance can be struck between proxy measures used for contract management and payment and a more thorough review of outcome measures upon contract renewal

Key Issue: Using How Well Measures

- If the services are evidence based or a model program with specific components required for effectiveness, ensure that there are measures in place under “how well are we doing,” to ensure that the model is implemented as required by both the model description and the contract.
- “How well” measures are needed to ensure that the services are delivered according to the contract AND to manage the program at appropriate intervals throughout the course of the contract
- Most importantly, “how well” measures are a critical tool for understanding the outcomes achieved

Payment and Contract Renewal

- **Include** at least one measure of “How much?” (service level), “How well” (quality), and “Is anyone better off?” (customer outcome) in the array of measures used to trigger payment. Also include a measure of timely and accurate reporting of customer data .
- **Phase in** the link between payment and performance when straight cost reimbursement strategies have been used in the past.
- **Make contract renewal** contingent upon a review of past performance, including measures used for payment and other important “Is anyone better off?” measures that might not be available for use in payment during the course of the contract

Sample Use of Measures For Contracting Chart

Purpose of Measure	How Much?	How Well?	Is Anyone Better Off?
Monitoring	Service level to target	Program attendance rates Customer satisfaction (process) Fidelity to model measures	Customer satisfaction (outcome) Outcomes achieved while participating in program; newly identified outcomes achieved from prior contract period
Payment	Service level	Data entry timeliness Program completion rates	Improvement in assessment scores at exit; short term recidivism rates
Contract Renewal, Program Evaluation		Cost per outcome Return on Investment	Longer -term customer outcome measures, like 12 and 24 month recidivism rates, job retention rates, graduation rates, etc.

Recommendations for Implementation and Next Steps

The following is an implementation plan for applying RBA throughout the Juvenile Justice System:

1. Each Juvenile Justice (JJ) agency and organization (**any agency that is contributing to achieving the quality of life results indicated in the JJ results statement, that are servicing youth that are justice involved or at-risk of justice-involvement**) should align its work under the population model provided in this document, and articulate how each of its programs and services contribute to improving one or more of the primary indicators in the model.
2. Each JJ agency and organization should, if they have not already, choose one or more important programs to begin applying RBA. For these programs, they should:
 - a. Identify how the program contributes to the result
 - b. Select an array of how much, how well, and better off measures, drawing from the common measures detailed in this document where possible
 - c. Hold “turn the curve” sessions to determine how to improve on the most important of these measures
 - d. Develop a program report card (see samples in Appendix A) for the program
 - e. Develop a management report (can contain measures not appropriate for the program report card, but helpful for management)
 - f. If third party service providers are used, phase in performance based contracting as appropriate
 - g. Repeat this process for other programs, institutionalize the use of RBA throughout the organization
3. For the JJ system, develop a JJ Report Card displaying the result, data for the primary indicators, and the system performance measures identified in this report:
 - a. Using this report card, hold turn the curve session on each of the primary indicators, and articulate high level strategies to turn the curve on these indicators (**Please note, this has already been done for several of the primary indicators through the work of the JJPOC workgroups**).
 - b. These strategies can fall within the strategic service clusters articulated in this report:
 - i. Prevention
 - ii. Diversion
 - iii. Treatment
 - iv. Re-entry
 - c. Highlight new strategies, or areas that need further collaboration among partners.
 - d. Periodically review the population and system data to demonstrate progress and identify where more work needs to be done.
4. Provide technical assistance to agencies and organizations in all aspects of this development process.

Implementation Timeline

RBA Implementation Timeline	Start Date	End Date
Implementation Plan Reviewed by JJPOC	Mar-17	Mar-17
Implementation Plan/RBA Training of JJ Agency and Provider Staff	Jan-1	April 30
Provision of Individual Technical Assistance to JJ Agencies and Key Providers in Developing Performance Measures and Report Cards	Mar 17	April 30
Future Quarterly System Report Format	Mar 17	June 16
On-going Development of Key System Performance Measures	Mar 17	June 16
Follow-up RBA Training/Workshops to provide technical assistance in Performance Contracting	April 1	Jun-16
Report on RBA Implementation Progress and Next Steps	Jun-16	Jun-16

References

- Ammons, David N. (1995). Accountability For Performance: Measurement and Monitoring in Local Government. Washington, DC, ICMA.
- Friedman, Mark. (2006) Trying Hard Is Not Good Enough. Tafford Press.
- Julnes, Patria, and Holzer, Mark (2008). Performance Measurement: Building Theory, Improving Practice. Armonk, NY, M.E. Sharpe.
- Kaplan, Robert S., and Daniel P. Norton (1992). "The Balanced Scorecard - Measures That Drive Performance," *Harvard Business Review*, January-February. Pp. 71-79.
- Kravchuk, Robert S. and Schack, Ronald W. (1996). "Designing Effective Performance Measurement Systems Under the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993," *Public Administration Review*, July/August, pp.348-358.
- Martin, Lawrence L., "Performance Contracting For Professional and Other Services," Presented at 1999 Annual Meeting of American Society For Public Administration, Orlando, FL, April 9, 1999.
- L. Mazerolle, S. Bennett, E. Antrobus, and E. Eggins, "Procedural justice, routine encounters and citizen perceptions of police: main findings from the Queensland Community Engagement Trial (QCET)," *Journal of Experimental Criminology* 8 (2012): 343 –367.
- Tufte, Edward R., (1983). The Visual Display of Quantitative Information. Cheshire, CT, Graphic Press.
- T. R. Tyler, *Why People Obey the Law*. (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1990). See also M.S. Frazer, *The Impact of the Community Court Model on Defendant Perceptions of Fairness: A Case Study at the Red Hook Community Justice Center*. (New York: Center for Court Innovation, 2006
- Van Ness, Daniel W., Karen Heetderks Strong. *Restoring Justice—An Introduction to Restorative Justice*. 4th ed. New Province, N.J.: Matthew Bender & Co., Inc., 2010: 24
- Wheeler, Steven, (1987). Understanding Variation: The Key to Managing Chaos. Knoxville, Tennessee, SPC Press, Inc.
- Womack, James P. and Jones, Daniel T., (1996). Lean Thinking: Banish Waste and Create Wealth in Your Corporation. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Zehr, Howard. *Changing Lenses – A New Focus for Crime and Justice*. Scottsdale PA: 2005 (3rd ed), 271.