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What We Did

- Identified the success metrics that were most important to one of our key funders
- Worked closely with court personnel and clinical staff to develop methodology for measuring this metric
- Used results to improve decision making

What We Measured

Changes in the frequency and severity of adjudicated crimes committed by youth enrolled in Hamilton Choices

What We Got

- Better understanding of funder’s needs and success standards
- Better ability to meet those needs and standards
- Better ability to communicate our success in meeting those needs

Who We Are

- System of care in Hamilton County (Cincinnati) Ohio
- Designed to be a high intensity, time-limited level of care for children with multi-system involvement and who are at risk for out-of-home placement
- Blended funding, partnering with 5 child-serving government agencies
- Creating a broad community provider network to support the families served

Choices Foundation

- Systems of Care Principles (Clinical)
  - Family Involvement (Voice, Ownership, Access, Satisfaction)
  - Wraparound Principles
  - Multi-system Coordinated Care
- Care Management Technologies (Fiscal)
  - Capitated Rate
  - Outcome Based
  - Flexible Funding
- Technology Blending (Clinical & Fiscal)
  - Achieving outcomes within the capitated case rate
**Blended Funding**

- Juvenile Court
- Mental Health Board
- Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities Board
- Alcohol and Drug Addiction Board

**How We Got Started**

- Budget Considerations
- Limited Existing Data
- Community Safety Concerns

**What We Did**

- Focus on the type and frequency of new adjudicated court charges
- Required the classification of youth into three categories (youth with felonies, misdemeanors or status offenses)
- Need to look at what constitutes improvement or decline for each of these groups

**Business Rules**

- Developed by Juvenile Court personnel, so they were the ones to define improvement/decline
- Algorithms to determine improvement/decline based on classification
- Meaningful to the local system
- Could be adapted or modified to meet the needs of other court systems

**How It Worked**

- Used an ordinal month method so that we always looked at kids in the same way regardless of when they enrolled in Choices
- Weighted each quarterly score to take into account community vs. institutional days
- Averaged all scores to get an overall rating for each child
- Compared our results, using a record review and probation officer experiences to ensure that findings accurately described all youth

**What We Found**

- Results after applying juvenile justice business rules methodology
CAFAS Scores

- Results consistent with other measures

![Graph showing CAFAS scores for juvenile justice involved youth](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>124.36</td>
<td>37.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td>82.95</td>
<td>56.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Decrease of 41.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistical Test: p<.001, t (77) = 6.698

Expenditure Data

- Juvenile Justice Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Average Expenditures per ED</th>
<th>Adjusted Expenditures Per ED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$96</td>
<td>$91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$79</td>
<td>$79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implications

- Funding

  - Differences in results depending on the classification of youth
    - Able to convince judges to allow more youth with felony convictions to participate in Choices as an alternative to corrections
    - Need for better programs/services for status offenders
    - Move towards outcome-based funding
    - Provider report card

- What’s Next?

  - Expand study to include other programs serving Juvenile Court involved youth
  - Longitudinal look at youth once they leave Choices
    - Availability of post-Choices data
    - Length of stay decisions
  - Use of CANS data to better measure clinical outcomes for Juvenile Court referred youth

Questions?

Contact Information:

Courtney Hess
Chess Strategies
courtney@ruraltek.com

Ann Klein
Director of Outcomes and Evaluations
Hamilton Choices
aklein@hamiltonchoices.org

James Papp
Outcomes Consultant
Hamilton Choices
jpapp@hamiltonchoices.org