



Mentally Ill Offender Crime Reduction Local
Evaluation Report, Juvenile WRAP Project

Supporting Documents:

- Exhibit A: CSUC Qualitative Report
- Exhibit B: CSUS Final Report
- Exhibit C: MIOCR Logic Model

Brent Cardall,
Chief Probation Officer

Yolo County Probation Department
2780 East Gibson Road
Woodland, CA 95776

MIOCR Program Staff
Dan Fruchtenicht,
Asst. Chief Probation Officer
Michelle Vermette,
Supervising Probation Officer
Nick Liuzzi,
Deputy Probation Officer
Nate Palmer,
Administrative Services Analyst

Executive Summary

Wraparound services has been identified as a clinically and cost-effective program for at-risk youth in the criminal justice system. The Yolo County Mentally Ill Offender Crime Reduction (MIOCR) program sought to expand the current number of youth served in wraparound services. By expanding wraparound services to justice involved youth, the Probation Department endeavored to improve the youths' quality of life, mental health outcomes and community supports, and resilience. They sought to reduce the rate of recidivism, incarceration and substance abuse among this population and ensure the sustainability of MIOCR augmented wraparound services in Yolo County for Probation involved youth.

The Sacramento State Yolo County Mentally Ill Offender Crime Reduction Program Qualitative Findings Report and Final Evaluation Report concluded measurable improvement in youth's quality of life and mental health outcomes (See Exhibit A: CSUS Qualitative Findings Report and Exhibit B: CSUS Final Report).

Problems encountered during the grant period included lack of eligible youth, staff transitions, and available data. During the second year of the grant it was determined there was not a sufficient number of available youth eligible for services. Therefore, the criteria was modified to eliminate the need for an Axis I or Axis II diagnosis. This expanded the number of eligible youth significantly. The grant had a goal of serving 30 youth and their families and fell just short, serving 23 distinct youth and families. Another problem encountered was the transition of staff members during the grant period. The project director transitioned on four different occasions and the assigned Probation Officer transitioned one time. Furthermore, the wraparound services team had consistent staff turn-over. Finally, data collection was an evident problem that was encountered during the final evaluation of the program. The community based organization that was contracted with, Communicare, was unable to provide a significant amount of data in regards to the Youth Outcomes Questionnaire therefore limiting the validity of the results. Similarly, data representing school attendance was largely missing due to difficulty in collecting data from the school, differences in recording attendance, and missing information. Therefore, any results based upon school data need to be reviewed with caution.

The MIOCR grant had positive outcomes as described in both the CSUS Qualitative Findings Report (see Exhibit A) and CSUS Final Report (Exhibit B). Both youth and the families were positive about the program and expressed positive changes in the youths' behavior to which they related to the program. Similarly, parents in the program were able to identify possible areas of improvement in the program as well, which can be considered as improvements are made to wraparound services. Another significant outcome from the Yolo County MIOCR WRAP Project was a sizable

reduction in the re-arrest/booking rate of youth involved in the program. Prior to enrollment, the 23 youth participants had a combined 242 arrests and bookings into the Yolo County Juvenile Detention Facility. After enrollment into MIOCR WRAP, the combined amount of arrests/bookings while in program (59) and after completion of the Program (14) totaled 73 as of August 29th, 2018. Though it is difficult to conclude a true reduction associated with the MIOCR without more data, the arrest rate dropped 70% for these youth after they were enrolled into MIOCR WRAP. In full disclosure, two youth were incarcerated for a significant amount of time and remain in detention, and bookings in other counties or into the county jail were not captured, but the overall reduction speaks to the affect the measured clinical successes have had on the re-offense of this population.

One lesson learned from MIOCR is it is important to aggressively select the right staff and community based services to ensure that the service delays and response times program shifts are optimized. Several times during the grant term, both Probation and CommuniCare experienced turnover that compounded the difficulty in making program changes to the structure of the program because key positions were temporarily sidelined by required training.

Further, Yolo County Probation furnished Sacramento State University with the Final Local Evaluation Report (LER) Guidelines prior to the development of the Final Evaluation Report and the minimum required information is addressed through the Sacramento State Qualitative Findings (Exhibit A) and Sacramento State Final Reports (Exhibit B) and the MIOCR Logic Model (Exhibit C). This executive summary seeks to highlight areas of Yolo County Probation's MIOCR WRAP Project.

Project Description

Yolo County Probation, in conjunction with community and county government partners, sought to expand wraparound services for juveniles involved in the justice system. The target population of the MIOCR program was juvenile offenders with the highest risk of re-offending. The program had planned to serve 30 juveniles and their families over the three year grant period with wraparound services. The juveniles had to be formal Wards of the Court and exhibited a need for multisystem intervention. Specific details of the project populations can be found on pages 5 and 10 of the Executive Summary and Results Section in CSUS Final Report (Exhibit B). It was initially believed the juveniles must have an Axis I or Axis II diagnosis; however, these criteria were modified during the second year to expand the pool of eligible juveniles due to an overall declining placement population resulting from state changes to the foster care system under Continuum of Care Reform.

The Probation Department was responsible for overall project oversight and structure. It was the Probation Department's responsibility to ensure the project was progressing and running as designed and it was also the Probation Department that proposed any necessary course corrections when a program element was not working as intended. However, the Probation Department shared oversight with two major partners. The Yolo County Multi-Disciplinary Assessment and Referral Team (MDART) had oversight over referrals and managing the waiting list, if applicable, for project recipients. In addition, Communicare had oversight and autonomy regarding treatment decisions and dosage. Taking into consideration probation's input, it was Communicare that ultimately decided if the client was suitable for graduation or termination from wraparound services. Probation in turn would report those recommendations to the Court for formal actions, such as termination from probation.

Effectiveness of the MIOCR program was evaluated by Sacramento State University, Center for the Study of Criminology and Criminal Justice. They evaluated treatment fidelity, MIOCR youth outcomes, and individual youth progress over time. It was expected they would see a reduction in clinical symptoms and risk for reoffending and an increase in family functioning. It was also expected the cost of the MIOCR program would be less than the typical out of home placement the group of youth would otherwise have required.

Data Collection

At the inception of the grant period it was determined the Probation Department and Communicare would maintain data and report to Sacramento State University for analysis of the program. Communicare maintained records of participants' progress. Program youth and caregivers, as well as staff from Communicare and Probation were also asked to participate by the study researchers. Refer to page 8 of the CSUS Qualitative Findings Report (Exhibit A) for further details.

Additional studies were conducted by Sac State that utilized a non-experimental, realist design. Details, including methods and measures, are detailed beginning on page 10 of the CSUS Final Report (Exhibit B).

Research Design

The MIOCR program sought to offer services to 30 youth who were identified as high risk to reoffend as defined by the Ohio Youth Assessment System. They were Wards of the Court and initially required to be diagnosed with Axis I or Axis II mental health disorder or other diagnosed mental health condition that significantly impacted the youths' quality of life. These criteria were later modified to allow more youth to be eligible for services. The youth also had to be at risk for entering a higher level of care,

such as residential treatment, custodial facilities or other out of home placement. Many youth also faced current substance abuse or a significant history of substance abuse.

At the completion of the grant, 23 clients received wraparound services, the nature of wraparound services is such that each client receives an individual treatment plan based on the youth and family's strengths and needs. Therefore, each of the 23 referred clients received unique treatment services. However, the common intervention for all clients is utilization of the wraparound model and in particular the use of Child and Family Team meetings. The wraparound team may also refer the youth to other services as deemed necessary. These services were typically provided by Communicare clinicians and included Family Life Skills Parenting Program, Differential Response, Functional Family Therapy, Trauma Focused Cognitive Behavioral Therapy, Cognitive Behavioral Interventions for Substance Abuse, and cognitive behavioral groups interventions such as Seeking Safety and Thinking for a Change.

All treatment considerations were deferred to Communicare. However, in terms of what resources or interventions were provided to a client, these issues were staffed and decided at MDART. Youth in wraparound services, including youth receiving MIOCR funded wraparound services, were staffed on a monthly basis at MDART or as more often if deemed necessary. These services were then monitored by the wraparound team, discussed at Child and Family Team meetings, and at MDART when appropriate.

The Probation Department monitored and ensured clients met the appropriate criteria for participation in MIOCR funded wraparound services. Specifically, the Probation Department assessed each potential client utilizing the Ohio Youth Assessment System to determine the client's risk and needs. The Probation Department documented CFT sessions and other interventions via case notes and these case notes were regularly audited by the Project Director. In addition, the Probation Department maintained data and case notes on clients' adherence to court orders and performance in the community. The Probation Department also ensured any unspecified and unmet need of wraparound clients were addressed and met (i.e. clothing, transportation, incentives, enrichment activity and other non-treatment related needs). Finally, the Probation Department analyzed the progression of the project and requested several modifications of the original grant proposal to BSCC to ensure effective delivery of services and successful execution of the grant. For example, after conducting a self-audit and conferring with grant partners the Probation Department determined the scope of Probation's original grant proposal was too narrow in focus and the criteria to admit clients to MIOCR funded wraparound services needed to be broadened.

The role of MDART was to monitor and manage open wraparound slots for the project so that sufficient capacity was available for new clients. MDART also monitored project clients' progress in wraparound services. If a client was in crises or presented an extraordinary need, MDART would provide access to countywide interventions.

CommuniCare not only monitored all the treatment needs of clients but also monitored the clients' progress through wraparound services. CommuniCare was the ultimate authority in proposing whether or not a client was suitable for successful or unsuccessful termination from wraparound services. CommuniCare tracked dosage, treatment, wraparound milestones and client family self-sufficiency throughout wraparound programming. CommuniCare was also responsible for administering and recording client surveys and assessments such as the Youth Outcome Questionnaire, Youth Outcome Questionnaire self-report and Child and Adolescence Needs and Strengths (CANS).

Treatment outcomes were recorded by CommuniCare and provided to Sac State for a formal analysis. Further details are provided in Exhibit B Results of the Final Report in the section Program Graduation and Measures.

Logic Model

Please see attached Exhibit C for current logic model.

Results and Conclusions

Detailed results of the MIOCR program broken down by demographic characteristics, mental health diagnoses, treatment variables, youth outcomes questionnaire and youth outcomes questionnaire self-report, child and adolescent needs and strengths, treatment intensity clinical measures, and program graduation and measures are detailed in the CSUS Final Report (Exhibit B). In summary, 23 youth, with various significant mental health issues, were served by the program for an average of eight months, averaging 105 visits. The population was diverse and included a majority of non-white youth.

Clinical scores reported on indicate improvement over the course of treatment, in particular in the domains of interpersonal relations and critical items. Results also indicate youth with greater needs received greater program intensity. Also, youth who had more severe clinical scores in several domains were more likely to graduate the program, as were youth who had more treatment intensity.

Through utilizing the MIOCR program, Probation was able to increase the capacity of wraparound services from six youth to 14 at any given time. While the capacity to serve 14 youth was present, there were never more than eight active cases

at one time due to a reduced population of eligible youth. Over the course of the grant, 23 youth were served through the wraparound program. Twenty nine percent of those youth finished the program successfully and of those, 42% were able to successfully terminate from probation.

The MIOCR grant also expanded probation and Communicare staffing to meet the demand of additional wraparound capacity. Probation was able to contribute one dedicated Probation Officer to monitor cases. This position transitioned one time during the life of the grant. Communicare also added staff to their wraparound program. However, they experienced a high degree of turnover which impacted their ability to properly collect data.

Of significance in regards to rearrests, 83% of the youth engaged in wraparound services saw a decrease in the number of bookings into Juvenile Hall while participating in services while 100% of youth saw a decrease in the number of bookings after wraparound services were completed. It should be taken into consideration, however, that these numbers do not account for length of time in detention, out of county detentions, or bookings into the county jail.

Wraparound treatment services have been utilized as an alternative to out-of-home placement both due to better outcomes, but also because wraparound treatment is more cost effective. The Probation Department conducted a cost comparison of youth placed in out-of-home placement and then in the MIOCR WRAP Project. Yolo County Probation spent with match \$1,053,474 (projected) to serve 23 youth for an average cost of \$45,803 per youth served. The average placement term in Yolo County is 6 months to a year. The total expense for FY 2017-18 for Probation's out-of-home placement costs were \$670,494 with an average of 8.33 youth per year placed (for 9 months). The average cost to place one youth in out of home placement for a year was \$80,660.