

---

Fairbanks Juvenile Treatment Court  
An Evaluation Plan

November 2008

---

alaska judicial council

---



# ***Fairbanks Juvenile Treatment Court***

## **An Evaluation Plan**

**For: The Alaska Court System**

**By: The Alaska Judicial Council**

**November 2008**

Teresa W. Carns, Senior Staff Associate  
Susan McKelvie, Research Analyst

Contact:  
Teri Carns  
Alaska Judicial Council  
1029 W. Third Ave., Ste. 201  
Anchorage, AK 99501  
Email: [teri@ajc.state.ak.us](mailto:teri@ajc.state.ak.us)  
Phone: (907)279-2526 x 6  
Fax: (907)276-5046



# Table of Contents

- Part 1. Introduction
  - A. Background ..... 1
  - B. Need for evaluation plan ..... 2
  - C. Description of program ..... 3
  - D. Method ..... 4
  
- Part 2. Discussion
  - A. Performance measures ..... 6
  - B. Data collection and entry ..... 7
  - C. Evaluation plans ..... 10
  - D. Memoranda of agreement ..... 11
  
- Part 3. Summary ..... 12
  
  
- Appendices
  - A. List of data elements ..... 13
  - B. List of interviewees ..... 19
  - C. Draft agreement with DJJ ..... 23
  - D. List of resources ..... 29
  - E. Annotated table of performance measures ..... 33
  - F. Other issues mentioned by stakeholders ..... 39



## **Part 1 Introduction**

### **A. Background**

In mid-2008, the Fairbanks Juvenile Treatment Court began diverting its first few juveniles from adjudication in the regular juvenile justice system. The new project built on an informal set of procedures that had been in place in the Fairbanks court for several years. A team of professionals – judge, prosecutor, defense attorney, juvenile probation officer, and treatment professional – carefully screened each youth for eligibility. Did the youth qualify as a beneficiary of Alaska’s Mental Health Trust Authority, with an Axis I diagnosis in specific categories? Did the youth have an offense other than a violent or sexual offense? Was he or she between the ages of 12 and 18? Would the FJTC program provide both appropriate services for the juvenile and protection for the public?

The juveniles who entered the program in mid-2008 found a structure closely resembling that of Alaska’s other “Mental Health” courts:

- A team of professionals working together to closely supervise and monitor the treatment and other needs of a person with a criminal charge closely related to the individual’s mental health problems or situation;
- Referrals to treatment for mental health issues, and – if needed – for substance abuse problems;
- Monitoring of attendance at treatment and progress over a period of six to eighteen months;
- Regular monitoring for substance use;
- Provision of other services – housing, education, vocational skills, employment, and physical health services – as needed to support recovery and achievement of stability;
- Regular court hearings, presided over by the judge and attended by team members and the program’s participants;
- Use of incentives and sanctions to encourage cooperation with the program.

Juvenile mental health courts are found throughout the United States. The Fairbanks Juvenile Treatment Court is Alaska’s first program for juveniles; two mental health courts have operated in Anchorage and Palmer for a number of years. The success of the model has been demonstrated in Santa Clara County, California, and elsewhere.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Appendix D lists all of the reports and other documents reviewed for this report, including descriptions of the Santa Clara County court and other juvenile mental health courts.

Juvenile mental health treatment courts tend to differ from adult mental health courts in several important ways. First, the youth's family or guardian are an essential part of the process. Transportation to appointments, support for completion of assignments, emotional support, and monitoring of medications and other requirements must occur reliably throughout the program. Second, in some cases, the prognosis for recovery of a juvenile offender may be substantially better than for a typical adult offender. For most adult offenders, the goal is stability; for some youths, the goal may be substantial improvement or a complete resolution of the underlying problems. Third, between the ages of 12 and 18 years, the child's physical, emotional and mental development continues and must be taken into account when assessing progress and needed changes to the program. Treatment needs or living situations may change dramatically in the space of twelve months, requiring that the youth's plan be modified.

### ***B. Need for evaluation plan***

Two other components are considered essential to all of the therapeutic courts, including the mental health courts. Any successful court must rely upon close cooperation among its stakeholders, and substantial community support. And in order to manage the court well and show that it is indeed successful, an evaluation plan must begin with the court's planning and receive attention throughout the court's activities. Evaluation plans have accompanied all of Alaska's successful courts, documenting the progress of participants, enabling managers to adapt to specific situations, and allowing legislators, the community and funders to make informed decisions.

The court requested that this evaluation plan:

- Establish performance measures;
- Specify detailed methods for compiling data, including who will collect the data, when, and where the data will come from; and
- Define the components of the outcome evaluations.

The court has also asked that this evaluation plan include draft memoranda of agreement with agencies outside the court system whose data would be needed for outcome evaluations. The memoranda of agreement should describe the data elements that would come from another agency, how the data would be shared between the agencies, and protections for the confidentiality of the juveniles' records and other agencies' records. The draft memorandum for this report is included with this report as Appendix C.

### **C. Description of the program**

The FJTC program is modeled on the successful Santa Clara County program, and court's intention is that it maintain fidelity to the model to the extent possible. The FJTC program is described in a series of documents<sup>2</sup> and guidebooks, including a Policy and Procedures Manual, and guides for professionals, parents, and youth involved in the program.<sup>3</sup>

The process involves:

- **Referral and eligibility screening.**<sup>4</sup> Typically, a juvenile probation officer refers a youth to the program, although judges, attorneys and others also may make referrals. Bi-weekly, the eligibility screening committee meets and reviews each application on a case-by-case basis. Juveniles must meet three basic criteria: 1) an Axis 1 diagnosis; 2) charged with a crime in juvenile court that is not a sex offense or a violent felony; and 3) between twelve and eighteen years old. Eligibility decisions also depend on space available in the program, and the order of the waiting list.
- **Independent mental health evaluation and final eligibility decision.** If the youth is not eligible or decides to not opt-in to the program, he or she returns to the regular juvenile court process. The eligibility screening committee tracks each person referred to the programs, and describes the reasons why the person did not participate in the program. The final eligibility decision is made by the judge and the Multi-disciplinary Team.
- **Opt-in agreement.** If the youth is considered eligible for the program, he or she is admitted to the program. The Juvenile Probation Officer prepares a case plan; the court defers or holds the case in abeyance, and the juvenile and others sign needed waivers and agreements.
- **Action on case plan.** The juvenile begins work on the case plan, which generally includes actions to be taken for schooling, mental health treatment, substance abuse treatment (if needed) and monitoring, development of mentoring relationships, and other needed services (family services, physical health treatment, housing, and so forth). The case plan also may include restitution and community work service.

---

<sup>2</sup> The basis for the program is the October 2007 version of *Fairbanks Juvenile Treatment Court Standards*, prepared for the court by Linden Staciokas and Ted Sponsel (see Appendix D for detailed citation). The *Standards* are based on the Santa Clara County court, with modifications to meet the needs in Fairbanks.

<sup>3</sup> Handbooks are available from the FJTC.

<sup>4</sup> The juvenile's mental health will be considered in various depths along the way. *Screening*: A quick, brief process, using the DHSS Client Status Review (CSR, a one-page document) or other similar tools that do not necessarily require professional administration. *Assessment*: DJJ uses the Youth Services Inventory (YSI) which will give some amount of information about mental health issues. *Evaluation*: A professional evaluation would establish a diagnosis of mental disorder(s), using the DSM definitions. It would be done by a professional. *Neuro-psych evaluation*: A neuro-psych evaluation would also be done by a professional, and would include tests to discover a physical or neurological basis, if any, for specific dysfunctional behavior. Not all of these different levels of assessing the juvenile's mental state and ability would be used for every participant.



- **Periodic meetings with court and Multi-Disciplinary Team.** The juvenile meets periodically with the court; the Multi-Disciplinary Team meets before each court hearing.
- **Extended period of court supervision.** The program is expected to last between six and eighteen months, depending on the juvenile's needs.

#### ***D. Methodology***

The Council took the following steps to prepare this report:

1. **Review the existing literature about mental health court databases, and about data collection for juveniles.** Sources include the work done by Sponset and Staciokas to create the court and develop performance measures, the Council's reports on therapeutic court databases, Internet searches,<sup>5</sup> and information from Hornby Zeller Associates about their recommendations for mental health court data collection.<sup>6</sup>
2. **Conduct user and stakeholder interviews.** Council staff interviewed sixteen key players in the Fairbanks Juvenile Treatment Court, some two or more times.<sup>7</sup> Interviewees discussed the creation and purpose of the court, its daily management and operations, the desired outcomes, and the procedures in place or expected for data collection. In addition to the interviews, Council staff participated in a demonstration of one of the possible databases,<sup>8</sup> viewed and discussed other databases,<sup>9</sup> and toured the Fairbanks Boys and Girls Home.<sup>10</sup>
3. **Review Performance measures and determine possible changes, additions.** The Council prepared a table of possible performance measures, using the Fairbanks Juvenile Treatment

---

<sup>5</sup> Among the Internet sources available are the BJA-funded American University Clearinghouse for Drug Courts (which has a great deal of information on all types of therapeutic courts), Center for Court Innovation, the National Center for State Courts, and numerous other organizations that deal with juveniles, mental health courts, and therapeutic court databases.

<sup>6</sup> Hornby Zeller Associates, Inc. recently completed an MHTA-funded study for the Alaska Court System that evaluated the Anchorage Mental Health Court. In their report, HZ Associates recommended: "Recommendation 7: Provide more resources for the collection and entry of data for all therapeutic courts in Alaska. . . . Many data elements necessary to meet the evaluative needs of a mental health court were missing."

<sup>7</sup> Appendix B lists the interviewees, their association with the project, and reasons for interviewing them.

<sup>8</sup> Council staff participated in a demonstration that was sponsored by the court for its staff of the TRI-CEP web-based database.

<sup>9</sup> Council staff viewed the existing FJTC database, and discussed it with its designers and its user; viewed and discussed the Anchorage CRP database with its user (Kate Sumey) and its designer (Andrew Ferguson, Hornby Zeller); and briefly viewed a possible AKAIMS add-on drug court module during a meeting with the Division of Behavioral Health staff.

<sup>10</sup> A new facility in Fairbanks for juveniles with mental health issues that expects to work closely with FJTC participants.

Court Standards,<sup>11</sup> the Hornby Zeller evaluations of the Anchorage and Palmer CRPs, Bureau of Justice Affairs reports on evaluating mental health courts and juvenile drug courts, and the measures incorporated in the state Department Division of Behavioral Health Client Status Review forms.<sup>12</sup> Council staff reviewed the proposed performance measures with the interviewees, and suggested modifications (see Discussion, below).

4. **Describe existing databases, and analyze their value for evaluating the FJTC.** The Council reviewed six existing databases that could contain data useful to the evaluation of the FJTC. These are described below in Part 2. The Council also viewed demonstrations of two other databases (TRI-CEP, and a drug court module for AKAIMS) that were proposed for possible use by FJTC.
5. **Draft agreements with agencies participating in the data collection and entry for this project.** During its interviews, the Council asked for examples of memoranda of agreement, confidentiality agreements, waivers used for information release by participants in the court, and research agreements used by the court and other agencies for similar programs.

---

<sup>11</sup> The Council relied on the 10/07 version of the *Standards*. The document was prepared for the court by consultants Ted Sponsel and Linden Staciokas.

<sup>12</sup> See Appendix D for more detailed references for each of these sources, and Appendix E for the annotated table of performance measures.

## Part 2 Discussion

### A. *Performance measures*

The Council reviewed all of the performance measures proposed in the Standards, discussed those and other performance measures with stakeholders, and reviewed existing literature for additional possible measures. The focus was on outcome measures. Reports for the court that could be used to track participation, highlight progress and problems, and calculate costs and benefits were also considered. Appendix E is a table of possible performance measures. They are annotated to show where the data would be located, and to indicate their usefulness and availability.

**General considerations:** Two general considerations arose. First, the performance measures need to be applied to all participants in the program, not just graduates. This is absolutely essential for a reliable and valid evaluation. Second, after talking with stakeholders, it appears that it will be very time-consuming and difficult to find and interview participants a year after they have left the program to ask them about their mentor and their treatment or their other progress. As a result, it seems best for the performance measures to include only variables that can be tracked through agency records. It is relatively simple and quick to locate records of further referrals or arrests, or additional time in residential programs.

**Sponsel and Staciokas** Most of the performance measures proposed by Sponsel and Staciokas appeared useful and feasible. One measure that raised concerns was the continuing mentor relationship: “at least 60% of the graduates continued to have a strong relationship with a mentor for at least one year after leaving the program.” One stakeholder was concerned that it might be difficult to establish clearly who the mentor was, or that the juvenile had a “mentor.” The original consultants for the project (Sponsel and Staciokas) believed that the model court (Santa Clara County, California) found that mentors were important to the youth’s success, and believed that the mentor needed only to be a strong adult presence in the youth’s life, whether parent, guardian, teacher, or other adult figure.

**Other performance measures** Appendix E also lists some measures proposed by Hornby Zeller, some proposed for adult mental health courts by BJA, and some that are collected by programs with grant funds from the Division of Behavioral Health. These are included to give a range of possibilities for future evaluators to consider. It will not be feasible for FJTC to collect all of these data, and future evaluators may not have the resources to acquire the data from other sources.

## **B. Data Collection**

### **1. Databases**

At the time of this report (November 2008) the Council had assessed the value of several databases for evaluation of the FJTC. These were:

- **FJTC database:** This Access database was adapted from a database created for the Barrow Misdemeanor Court.<sup>13</sup> Important missing elements were exit data for both participants who did not complete the program and for those who graduated. Other necessary data fields also were missing, and it was unstable. By early October, the Project Manager had found it too difficult to use and was not entering data. (Any data already entered could be transferred to another database with no significant difficulties.) It exists only on the Project Manager's computer and has no backup provisions.
- **Anchorage CRP database:** This stand-alone Access database was designed by Hornby-Zeller during their contract with the court system to evaluate the Anchorage and Palmer Court Coordinated Resource projects. It was based on a database used by addiction-oriented therapeutic courts and modified to include variables for the CRPs. It is a more complete and more functional database than the existing FJTC database. Some relatively simple modifications would be needed to make the database suitable for use by the FJTC.
- **CourtView:** The court system's main case management system has information needed to evaluate the FJTC, including information about the offenses, case numbers for linking to other data sources, and numbers of court hearings (a possible measure of the service provided in the program).
- **JOMIS:** This is the Division of Juvenile Justice's database. It includes information about the juvenile's past referrals and records with the juvenile courts; information about the current case and charges; and limited information about the case plan. In the future, it will include further referrals to DJJ for offenses committed by participants both during and post-program, disposition information about the participant, and the juvenile probation officer's notes. This database is essential to evaluation of many of the proposed performance measures.
- **DHSS:** To the extent available, this department's data will be needed for assessing the participants' mental health status, hospitalizations, and continued treatment post-program (if that performance measure continues to be used). The information will come from API and other treatment programs used by the court and funded at least in part by DHSS. DHSS also includes the Office Of Children's Service; data from OCS may be helpful to evaluate the FJTC. For example, participation in the FJTC could be ended because of a decision by OCS (or the court) that a child's custody status needed to change.

---

<sup>13</sup> The Barrow Misdemeanor Court database was created for Barrow by Ted Sponsel and Linden Staciokas (see footnote \_\_, supra). They adapted it for temporary use by the FJTC after completing their work of developing standards and performance measures for the FJTC.

- **AKAIMS:** This is the Division of Behavioral Health database. It contains quality of life information from the Client Status Review forms about those participants who are treated at DBH-funded programs. It will not contain data about those treated at other programs.

It appears that several of the programs most likely to handle part or all of the treatment for FJTC participants do not use AKAIMS. These include the Tanana Chiefs Conference program, and any private providers. At the time the program is evaluated, a retrospective look at the actual participants may show that a large enough percentage of them were served by AKAIMS programs to make the data worthwhile. At that time, the appropriate research agreements could be signed, and the data extracted. It does not seem useful to take that step at the present.

## 2. Data collection

At the time of this report, it appeared that the only staff person available to enter data for the FJTC participants into the FJTC database was the part-time Project Manager. It was not clear whether other duties, in the long run, would leave enough time for entry of at least the minimum data. It did seem clear that entry of desirable data about the operation of the program – e.g., use of incentives and sanctions, on-going data from periodic court hearings – was unrealistic. One possible approach could be that the Project Manager assure that some of the more essential data are kept on paper records so that an evaluator can review them and enter the data if resources permit. Other desirable data such as incentives and sanctions may be just too complex and time-consuming even for that approach. If the court wants to have that data collected, the project will need extra resources devoted specifically to that purpose.

Data collection for the other databases – CourtView, JOMIS, DBH, and so forth – is the responsibility of those agencies. There did not seem to be any issues either with collection of those data or with agencies' willingness to make them available for evaluation of the FJTC. The agencies appeared willing to make the data available for either shorter term interim evaluations, or for full-blown outcome evaluations every few years.

## 3. Gaps in data collection

Notable gaps exist in the current data collection processes:

- **Lack of exit information:** Any database used to collect data for evaluation of this court should include the following variables, for all of the program participants, non-graduates as well as graduates: Why did the offender leave the program (graduated; committed new offenses; did not stay sober; needed treatment not available in this area; removed from Fairbanks by OCS; and so forth). What was the offender's status on the following variables at the time of departure from the program: housing, education, employment, substance abuse, and mental health status (e.g., were these factors stable)?

None of the existing databases being considered has adequate fields for these data. The needed fields could be added fairly easily to the Anchorage CRP database. The TRI-CEP database, which is one of the choices being considered by the court for a web-based program also has too few fields to capture all of the exit information needed for each

participant. Resources have not been available to examine any other databases being considered in detail.

- **Lack of information about incentives and sanctions:** None of the databases have adequate fields to collect this information. Ideally, it should be tracked in some detail. The database could have this capability built in. The more important question is whether anyone will have the time to record all of this information (some of which is somewhat subjective). If the participant returns to detention or residential treatment or hospitalization, there will be some record of that at the institution. Other sanctions, and most incentives will be more difficult to track.

One possibility is that staff or a contracted evaluator could record the use of incentives and sanctions at one or more hearings in a limited data collection project. Although these data are important to understanding how a therapeutic court is actually functioning, and should be included if possible, they are not as critical to an outcome evaluation. They should not be the priority for data collection or analysis.

At present, the Anchorage CRP database (which might be considered for use by the FJTC) does not have fields for entering incentive/sanction data from the court hearing. The Anchorage CRP Project Manager also noted the possibility that the case manager/coordinator might be offering incentives outside the court hearing, which might then not be recorded.

- **No procedure in place for post-program follow-up.** Several of the performance measures call for information to be collected a year down the road – e.g., 75% of youth will continue in recommended treatment for at least one year after graduation (and this should be expanded to include the status for one year after any participation); 60% of graduates will maintain a relationship with mentor/adult for a year (again should be expanded to include all participants). As discussed elsewhere, it will be difficult and resource-intensive to track these particular variables post-program, and the project may want to consider either not using them or seeking out the needed resources for obtaining them.
- **New variables to be added.** The table in Appendix A that lists variables that should be in the database for evaluation purposes shows several that are not in the current database, or in the Anchorage CRP database at the level of detail needed. These include: enrollment in tutoring for English literacy, enrollment in computer classes, maintaining required grades, stable living situation, stable mental health situation, sobriety, and so forth. Also lacking in the existing Anchorage CRP database are fields for: offender's prior criminal history; offender's prior API history; whether the offender is a Trust beneficiary, and if so, of which groups is the offender a member (some offenders will have multiple diagnoses); and detailed information on reasons for exit.
- **Drug use and testing information.** Any database adopted needs to have basic information about drug and alcohol use at the time of intake and exit from the program. The project also should maintain information, at least in paper records, about requirements for monitoring of substance use, and about substance abuse education or treatment. If the Anchorage CRP

database is used, these fields would need to be added, along with the other variables described above.

- **Back-up and preservation of data.** During the field work for this report (September and October 2008), there was no procedure to back up the FJTC database. It existed on one isolated computer in the court system. If the court adopts a web-based database in the near future, and the FJTC can transfer its existing data to the new database, it may be acceptable to wait a short time. Otherwise, the FJTC database should be backed up regularly, preferably daily. There are relatively simple web-based programs for doing this that cost little or nothing. If the FJTC begins to use the Anchorage CRP database, provision should be made for backing that up.

### **C. Evaluation plans**

#### **1. Interim reports**

The court would like periodic reports from the FJTC on the number of participants, the length of time they have been participating, their demographic characteristics, and interim measures of success such as more stable housing, decline in referrals to DJJ, retention rates of participants in the program, and so forth. These interim reports should be readily available to the court from any of the databases under consideration.<sup>14</sup>

#### **2. Outcome evaluations**

The court anticipates that it will contract with an independent evaluator after three to four years of program operation. The independent evaluator will use data maintained by FJTC, data from CourtView, data from JOMIS (obtained under a memorandum of agreement<sup>15</sup>), and possibly data from other sources. The evaluator should have more than adequate data to conduct a rigorous outcome evaluation if the project maintains comparable data on all participants (not just graduates), maintains pre-program data on all participants, and collects data at the time of exit from the program from all participants. It would also be ideal if the court could make provision for maintaining data on a selected comparison group of juvenile offenders not considered for the program; description of the process for doing this is outside the scope of this report.

#### **3. Cost Benefit evaluations**

Cost benefit evaluations are beyond the scope of this report. At the point that the court wishes to undertake a cost benefit evaluation of the FJTC, it will have several sources of models and data to assist in this endeavor. These include the recent Hornby Zeller evaluations of the Anchorage and Palmer CRPs, the Judicial Council's collaboration with The Urban Institute and the UAA Justice

---

<sup>14</sup> Because the FJTC database that the program initially used was broken at the time of this report and there were no plans to repair it, it is not included in this discussion. If the court wanted to continue to use that database, in addition to repairing it and adding a number of variables, the court would also have to build in a reporting capacity that the database does not have at the present.

<sup>15</sup> See proposed draft in Appendix C.

Center to evaluate the Anchorage Misdemeanor Wellness Court, and the planned ISER report for the legislature and the Criminal Justice Working Group on evidence based programs in Alaska. All of these documents have Alaska costs, Alaska benefit analyses, and suitable background information that could be used to evaluate the costs and benefits of the FJTC.

***D. The memoranda of agreement***

The court asked that this report include draft memoranda of agreement with DBH, DJJ, and any other entity that would hold data needed by the independent evaluator at some point in the future. At this point it appears that the only memorandum of agreement needed immediately is with Division of Juvenile Justice.<sup>16</sup> Other memoranda can be drafted as needed later in the project, but it appears that only the JOMIS database will be an essential part of any outcome evaluation. Ideally, information might be available from Division of Behavioral Health, API, OCS, and possibly other sources.

---

<sup>16</sup> A draft of a possible Memorandum of Agreement with DJJ for use of JOMIS data is in Appendix C.



## **Part 3 Summary**

The Fairbanks Juvenile Treatment Court is an innovative approach to responding to juveniles in the criminal justice system who have mental health problems. The therapeutic court approach calls for an Multi-Disciplinary Team made up of judge, attorneys, juvenile probation officer and treatment professionals to assess and guide juveniles and their families through individually-tailored programs. Juveniles and their teams meet frequently, often weekly, to review progress. At the court hearings, judges may reward or sanction behavior. Graduation occurs when the youth has met the conditions set out in the individual case plan. Most juveniles will have made progress in stable housing, stable mental health with a plan for follow-up care, education, and family or other social relationships.

The Alaska Court System asked the Alaska Judicial Council to prepare an evaluation plan and draft agreements for the FJTC. In preparing this report, the Council found:

- The FJTC program appears to have a solid foundation because it is building on informal agreements used in Fairbanks for several years for juveniles with mental health problems.
- A database that can be used to evaluate the FJTC should have elements unique to a juvenile court, and unique to a mental health court. Existing databases can be adapted for this use.
- The FJTC does not have an operable database as of mid-November 2008. It would be helpful to have one as quickly as possible. The Anchorage CRP database may be a good choice, if adapted to the FJTC needs.
- Any evaluation of the FJTC must make provision for collecting data at intake on all participants that includes information about areas such as housing and education in which the program expects progress.
- An evaluation of the FJTC also must make provision for collecting data about every participant at the end of time in the court. The evaluation must collect information about participants who opt out or are discharged, as well as graduates.
- The performance measures created by Sponsel and Staciokas for the FJTC are appropriate and should be used. However, the court's ability to obtain follow-up data about participants after they have been out of the program for one year may limit the usefulness of the mentoring and treatment performance measures.
- The performance measures can be supplemented with others listed in the report, depending on the availability of information and resources to do additional analyses.

- Because the DJJ database, JOMIS, appears to be the only database outside the court system with consistent and helpful data available for the FJTC evaluation, the Council drafted one possible memorandum of agreement for the court to sign with DJJ.



***Appendix A***  
***List of Data Elements***



## **Appendix A**

### **Data Elements Needed to Evaluate Fairbanks Juvenile Treatment Court**

The data elements listed below should provide sufficient information for accurate and thorough outcome evaluations of the Fairbanks Juvenile Treatment Court. They also will be helpful for process evaluations. Process and outcome evaluations also may rely on data from CourtView.

The two tables below show, first, the essential data elements for evaluation, and their source; and second, the data elements included in the standard AKAIMS Client Status Review, which may be available for some FJTC clients.

The list presumes the following:

- The FJTC Project Manager will enter the data about each FJTC participant that goes into the FJTC database.
- “Participant” will be defined to include all persons who formally opt-in to the court.
- In addition to the information about all participants, the Project Manager will also record limited data about all persons who are *referred* to the court, including full name, date of birth, other identifying information, court case number, charges, and a reason why the person was not considered eligible for participation. The data will be sufficient to track the person in JOMIS, CourtView, APSIN and other relevant databases.
- The Juvenile Probation Officer will enter all data about the participant that goes into the JOMIS database. JOMIS data will be available to the court’s chosen evaluator as needed for process and outcome evaluations.
- Court personnel will enter data about the participant in CourtView in the course of their normal activities.
- The participant will waive confidentiality rights for data in FJTC, JOMIS, API, other DBH, and other state databases for purposes of evaluations of the program. Evaluators will commit to maintaining and using data strictly for statistical analyses, with safeguards to prevent identification of any individual.
- Data entered about the participant in other databases including AKAIMS, API, DOC, DPS and other databases may be used to supplement the outcome data in the FJTC, JOMIS and CourtView databases.

**Table 1  
Data Elements Needed to Evaluate Fairbanks Juvenile Treatment Court**

<i>Name of element</i>	<i>When Collected</i>	<i>Notes</i>	<i>Proposed Data Source</i>
Participant name: first, MI, last	Intake		FJTC
Date of birth	Intake		FJTC
Court case number	Intake		FJTC
Gender	Intake		FJTC
Ethnicity	Intake		FJTC
Family status	Intake	Variables could include: with parent; with family member; in foster home; in group home; residential placement; other	FJTC
Education status	Intake; exit		FJTC
GAF score (Global Assessment of Functioning)	Intake; exit; periodically during program	This test must be administered by a professional; is commonly used in Fairbanks and elsewhere	FJTC
Charges	Intake		FJTC
Prior criminal history	Intake		JOMIS
JOMIS number	Intake		JPO provides to FJTC
Use of mental health services	Intake, exit	50% of participants will be using at exit	Intake: FJTC Exit: FJTC
Use of substance abuse services	Intake, Exit	50% of participants will be using at exit	Intake: FJTC Exit: FJTC
Complete 90% of case plan goals and skills	Initial case plan: Case plan in effect at exit:	50% of participants will have completed 90% of the case plan goals and skills	Some elements will be in JOMIS; some elements In FJTC
Enroll in school or vocational training within two weeks of entry	After intake	100% will achieve	FJTC.
Enroll in English literacy tutoring	After intake	90% will achieve (by what time?)	FJTC.
Enroll in computer class (if no skills)	After intake	90% enrolled (by what time?)	FJTC.
Attend school or training and maintain average "C"/pass	During program; at exit	70% achieve (by what time?)	Exit: FJTC.
<b>Continue in recommend treatment for at least 1 year post-grad.</b>	<b>Post-exit, but no good way to collect</b>	<b>75% achieve. May not continue as a measure for post-graduation.</b>	<b>If data are collected, would have to be FJTC.</b>
Mentor identified	During program	Should also have notes field for information about the mentor	FJTC
<b>Post-grad, use adult mentor for at least one year</b>	<b>Post-exit, but no good way to collect</b>	<b>60% achieve. May not continue as a measure for post-graduation.</b>	<b>If data are collected, would have to be FJTC.</b>
Number of referrals during program participation.	On-going; reported at exit	Also, type of charge	JOMIS

**Table 1  
Data Elements Needed to Evaluate Fairbanks Juvenile Treatment Court**

<i>Name of element</i>	<i>When Collected</i>	<i>Notes</i>	<i>Proposed Data Source</i>
Number of referrals for one year after program participation.	Post-exit, one year	Also, type of charge	JOMIS
Number of admissions to jail during program	On-going; reported at exit	Reason for admit	APSIN
Number of admissions to jail after program	Post-exit, one year	Reason for admit	APSIN
Number of detention days: sanctions	On-going; reported at exit	Reason for sanction	JOMIS
Number of detention days: new offenses	On-going; reported at exit	Type of new offense	JOMIS
Not referred for the same / worse crime during program	On-going; reported at exit	50% of participants achieve this	JOMIS
Not referred for any crime during program	On-going; reported at exit	40% of participants achieve this	JOMIS
Not arrested or referred for any crime at least one year post program	Post-exit, one year	65% of graduates achieve this; no measure stated for non-graduating participants	JOMIS; APSIN
Not arrested or referred for same / worse crime at least one year post program	Post-exit, one year	75% of graduates achieve this; no measure stated for non-graduating participants	JOMIS; APSIN
Increased length of time until subsequent arrest/referral	Post-exit, one year	Survival analysis	JOMIS
Improve mental health	Measured at intake and exit using standard assessments	Needs to be quantified or measurable	FJTC
Decrease substance abuse	Measured at intake and exit using standard assessments	Needs to be quantified or measurable	FJTC
Shorter stays in detention	Compare one year before; during program; one year after	Pre-post comparisons	JOMIS
Fewer returns to detention	Compare one year before; during program; one year after	Pre-post comparisons	JOMIS
Improved family situation	Measured at intake and exit using standard assessments ?		FJTC
Maintain foster care placements/return home	Reported at intake and exit by FJTC staff		FJTC
Reduce number of psychiatric hospital visits		Pre-post comparisons	FJTC



<b>Table 1</b>			
<b>Data Elements Needed to Evaluate Fairbanks Juvenile Treatment Court</b>			
<b><i>Name of element</i></b>	<b><i>When Collected</i></b>	<b><i>Notes</i></b>	<b><i>Proposed Data Source</i></b>
Reduce length of psychiatric hospital stays		Pre-post comparisons	FJTC
Improved housing situation	Reported at intake and exit by FJTC staff	Pre-post comparisons	FJTC
Improved employment situation (if applicable)	Reported at intake and exit by FJTC staff	Pre-post comparisons	FJTC

<b>Table 2</b>	
<b>AKAIMS performance measures if available for FJTC</b>	
1. Ability to perform daily activities [in spite of emotional or mental problems]	AKAIMS measure
2. Social, subsistence, sports, etc. activities in past month	AKAIMS measure
3. Ability to perform daily activities [in spite of physical health problems]	AKAIMS measure
4. Use of emergency room services in past six months	AKAIMS measure
5. Suicide or hurting self thoughts	AKAIMS measure
6. Alcohol use in past month	AKAIMS measure
7. Illegal drug use, or un-prescribed use of prescribed drugs	AKAIMS measure
8. Support of people in your life for your recovery	AKAIMS measure
10. Receipt of public assistance in past 3 months [this may not be applicable to juveniles?]	AKAIMS measure
11. Frequency of worry about affording basic needs	AKAIMS measure
12. Current housing situation	AKAIMS measure
13. Current involvement with legal system	AKAIMS measure, <i>also JOMIS</i>
14. Feeling of safety in home, school, community	AKAIMS measure
15. Feeling of connectedness, meaning in life, past month	AKAIMS measure
16. Do you have any children under the age of 18?	AKAIMS measure

***Appendix B***  
***List of Interviewees***



**Table 3**  
**Interviews for Fairbanks Juvenile Mental Health Court Database**

<b><i>Name of stakeholder</i></b>	<b><i>Location/position</i></b>	<b><i>Reason for interview</i></b>
Michelle Bartley	State Coordinator, Therapeutic courts	Establish detailed parameters of the project from the court's standpoint.
Judge Blankenship	Fbx. Superior Ct	What data does the judge need?
Janice Lorenzen	Project Manager	What data does Project Manager need? What data can project staff enter? Court staff? What data can come from other agencies?
Ted Sponsel and Linden Staciokas	Planning process for creation of Fbx Juv Mental Health Court	To clarify any points in the Standards and proposed performance measures. To give them an opportunity to emphasize what they believe are the priorities for the program.
Kate Sumey	Project Manager, Anch. CRP	Existing data collection in Anchorage CRP; her suggestions for improvements.
DJJ staff	Steve McComb (director), Karen Forrest (Programs), Susan McDonough (data)	Coordination and data sharing with JOMIS (DJJ information system).
Steve Williams	MHTA	What expectations does the Trust have for data from this project? What suggestions can they offer?
Hornby Zeller Assoc., Inc.	Evaluators of Anchorage CRP	What data elements do they perceive as needed for mental health court evaluation? What suggestions do they have?
Other stakeholders associated with the proposed court	Juvenile probation officers, treatment providers	Interviews included Angie Wenger (Juvenile Probation Officer), John Regitano (Family Centered Services), other FCA staff, .
Melissa Stone	Division of Behavioral Health	What data elements for evaluation of the court would come from AkAIMS or other DHSS databases? What needs to be considered for data sharing, especially in terms of confidentiality?



***Appendix C***  
***Draft Agreement with DJJ***



**Proposed  
Memorandum of Agreement  
between  
Alaska Court System (ACS)  
and  
State of Alaska Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ)**

***Parties to the Agreement***

This memorandum of agreement (MOA) is between the Alaska Court System and the State of Alaska Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ).

***Background***

The Alaska Court System in cooperation with the Division of Juvenile Justice, the Department of Law, the defense attorney agencies in Fairbanks, and providers of treatment and other services has established the Fairbanks Juvenile Treatment Court (FJTC). The FJTC works with juveniles charged with offenses, generally between the ages of 12 to 18 who qualify as beneficiaries of the Mental Health Trust Authority and meet certain other requirements. The FJTC accepts eligible juveniles who agree to participate in the program and for whom adjudication has been deferred or held in abeyance for the period of the program, typically six to eighteen months. Juveniles meet regularly with their Multi-Disciplinary Team (MDT) and the supervising judge to establish goals, develop and modify action plans, and to review progress. The judge may grant incentives or impose sanctions. The judge and MDT determine whether the participants continue in the court (they may be discharged in case of serious infractions or other issues) or graduate.

***Purpose of the Agreement***

The Alaska Court System will evaluate the FJTC periodically, to determine whether the program is operating as planned, and to determine whether the outcomes for participants show that the court effectively reduces recidivism and improves the functioning of participants. To carry out the evaluations, the ACS will draw on data maintained by the FJTC, data from its case management system CourtView, and data from other agencies. To adequately evaluate the short-term and long-term performance of the FJTC, the ACS must use data from JOMIS and from the DJJ files. The ACS may use its own staff and resources for short-term evaluations, and expects to contract with independent organizations for the long-term evaluations. This agreement sets out the terms and conditions of this use.

***Terms of Agreement***

1. The FJTC, ACS and/or contractors with ACS (together referred to as ACS) will identify the participants in the FJTC, together with any comparison groups chosen from other juveniles in the Fairbanks courts for the DJJ personnel.
2. DJJ will provide ACS with requested information about the juveniles identified, for research purposes only. The information will include offense and referral history for each juvenile, case plan and demographic information in JOMIS, and information about dates, lengths and



reasons for any detentions. DJJ and ACS will review the types of information maintained by JPOs in their paper files, and may grant ACS access to paper files with appropriate safeguards.

3. The ACS will promptly share its completed periodic reports and long-range outcome evaluations with DJJ.
4. To protect the confidentiality of all participants, the parties agree that:
  - A. The data provided by DJJ is confidential by law. The data may not be used for any purpose other than the evaluations of the FJTC.
  - B. The actual names and any other identifying information about the participants may not be distributed to any unauthorized person. Any use of the information must completely protect the identity of all participants.
  - C. The disclosure of confidential information obtained under this agreement may be considered a violation of law subject to penalty under both the provisions of Section 408 of Public Law 92-255 as amended by Section 303 of Public Law 93-282 described in 42 CFR Part 2 and Alaska Statute 47.30.845: Mental Health/ Confidential records. All parties are required to comply with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA), Public Law 104191, as applicable.
  - D. All participants in the FJTC will sign a waiver of confidentiality for purposes of research, as part of their official admission to the program.
5. This Agreement will be in effect from the date of signing until a party to the agreement gives written notice that it would like to amend or cancel the agreement. The agreement may only be amended in writing signed by both parties. Notice of cancellation must occur a minimum of sixty (60) days prior to cancellation.

Notices to the Alaska Court System related to this agreement shall be provided to:

Attn: Deputy Administrative Director  
Alaska Court System Administrative Office  
820 West Fourth Avenue  
Anchorage, Alaska 99501

The parties to this agreement are signing the agreement freely and voluntarily. They acknowledge their responsibilities under the agreement and will fulfill them in a mutually acceptable and effective manner.

Alaska Court System

---

Date

---

Division of Juvenile Justice

---

Date

***Alaska Judicial Council Draft FJTC Agreement  
November 14, 2008***



***Appendix D***  
***List of Resources***



## **Appendix D List of Resources**

1. A GUIDE TO COLLECTING MENTAL HEALTH COURT OUTCOME DATA, BJA Consensus Project, May 2005. Nineteen pages. Includes discussions of data needed for process and outcome evaluations, sources of data, funding and resources for evaluations, and planning for evaluation.
2. JUVENILE DRUG COURTS: STRATEGIES IN PRACTICE, BJA, March 2003. Seventy-six pages. Sixteen principles for creating, managing, and evaluating juvenile drug courts.
3. EVIDENCE-BASED JUVENILE OFFENDER PROGRAMS: PROGRAM DESCRIPTION, QUALITY ASSURANCE, AND COST. Washington State Institute for Public Policy. June 2007. Seven pages. Describes six evidence-based programs for juvenile offenders with cost-benefit analysis, and research citations.
4. OUTCOMES FROM THE LAST FRONTIER: AN EVALUATION OF THE ANCHORAGE MENTAL HEALTH COURT. Hornby Zeller Associates, Inc. May 2008. Sixty-five pages. A detailed statistical and cost analysis of the Anchorage Mental Health Court.
5. EVALUATION ISSUES IN MENTAL HEALTH PROGRAMMING IN THE JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM, OJJDP. August 2003. Fifty-two pages. Discusses risk factors, assessment techniques and tools, establishment of goals for juveniles with mental health issues, and evaluation measures.
6. IMPROVING RESPONSES TO PEOPLE WITH MENTAL ILLNESSES: THE ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF A MENTAL HEALTH COURT, BJA. 2005. Eleven pages. Identifies ten essential elements of mental health court design and implementation, tracking the ten key components of drug court design and implementation.
7. JUVENILE MENTAL HEALTH COURTS: AN EMERGING STRATEGY, NATIONAL CENTER FOR MENTAL HEALTH AND JUVENILE JUSTICE (NCMHJJ) Research and Program Brief. June 2006. Six pages. Summarizes current literature about juvenile mental health courts, with brief descriptions of Santa Clara County, Summit County (Ohio), and King County (Seattle) programs.
8. JUVENILE MENTAL HEALTH COURTS: PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS: PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES. NCMHJJ. August 2005. Brief descriptions of ten juvenile mental health courts in California, Ohio, and Washington state.
9. PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT OF DRUG COURTS: THE STATE OF THE ART. July 2008. National Center for State Courts. Describes innovations in drug court performance measurement, applicability of trial court performance measures to drug courts, and recently completed reports.

10. TRI-CEP DWI COURT MODULE. April 16, 2008 draft. Treatment Research Institute. Describes a web-based software program designed to store data for management and evaluation of DWI courts.
11. “Child Development, Children’s Mental Health and the Juvenile Justice System: Principles for Effective Decision-Making.” David E. Arrendondo, M.D. Published in *Stanford Law and Policy Review*, Vol.14.1 2003.
12. “Juvenile Mental Health Court: Rationale and Protocols.” David E. Arredondo, et al. *Juvenile and Family Court Journal*, Fall 2001.
13. “The Role of Specialty Mental Health Courts in Meeting the Needs of Juvenile Offenders.” Judge David L. Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law, 2004. <http://www.bazelon.org/issues/criminalization/publications/mentalhealthcourts/juvenilemhcourts.htm>. Describes Santa Clara, Los Angeles, and Hamilton Court (Ohio) juvenile mental health courts briefly. No evaluation information.
14. “Progress and Perils in the Juvenile Justice and Mental Health Movement.” Thomas Grisso, Ph.D. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law Online*. 2007.
15. “Prison Break,” Tim Shufelt, *The Ottawa Citizen*. August 30, 2008. Description of the Ottawa Youth Mental Health Court, in Ottawa, Canada.
16. *Fairbanks Juvenile Treatment Court Standards*, Ted Sponsel and Linden Staciokas. October 10, 2007 draft (most current draft)
17. FAIRBANKS JUVENILE TREATMENT COURT: POLICIES AND PROCEDURES, Alaska Court System, November 2008.
18. THERAPEUTIC JUSTICE STATEWIDE DATABASE, Alaska Judicial Council, September 2006.

***Appendix E***  
***Annotated Table of Performance Measures***





## **Appendix E Possible Performance Measures**

### **Fairbanks Juvenile Treatment Court**

The performance measures included in this chart came from several sources:

- Most of these performance measures were described in *Fairbanks Juvenile Treatment Court Standards*, prepared by Ted Sponsel and Linden Staciokas, in collaboration with the Fairbanks stakeholders in the court. Within that document, performance measures appear in Part IX, “Measurement of Success” (pages 12 and 13), and in Part I (page 1), that briefly describes improved outcomes for youth participating in the court.
- Several of the performance measures were recommended in a Bureau of Justice Assistance guide to collecting mental health court outcome data. They may be too cumbersome for the FJTC to adopt, given the limited resources available.
- H&Z refers to the Hornby Zeller Associates recent evaluation of the Anchorage Coordinated Resources Project (also known as the Anchorage Mental Health Court). The criteria used by Hornby Zeller for evaluation of that court are repeated here, to the extent that they were not already mentioned by S&S.
- DHSS uses a set of about fifteen measures for all clients in treatment programs, collected on the Client Status Review (CSR) at intake and periodically after that. One measure (#13) characterizes a client’s involvement in the legal system ranging from “None” to “Lock-up facility, mandatory hospitalization, involuntary commitment, or youth facility.” Because it covers a range of possible civil and criminal involvement, it is not as specific a measure of criminal recidivism as is desirable for participants in this program. However, the AKAIMS measures, taken as a group are consistent, widely used, and allow measurements of quality of life factors that are difficult to capture otherwise. As discussed in the body of the report, AKAIMS data are not likely to be available for many of the FJTC participants. They should be kept in mind as useful criteria.

**Table 4  
Possible Performance Measures: Fairbanks Juvenile Treatment Court**

<i>Name of measure</i>	<i>Who proposed</i>	<i>Other</i>	<i>Proposed Data Source</i>
Use of substance abuse and mental health services	S&S, p. 12	50% of participants will use	Intake: FJTC Exit: FJTC
Complete 90% of case plan goals and skills	S&S, p. 12	50% of participants will achieve	Exit: FJTC
Enroll in school or vocation. within two weeks of entry	S&S, p. 12	100% will achieve	FJTC
Enroll in English literacy tutoring	S&S, p. 12	90% will achieve (by what time?)	FJTC
Enroll in computer class (if no skills)	S&S, p. 12	90% enrolled (by what time?)	FJTC
Attend school or training and maintain average "C"/pass	S&S, p. 12	70% achieve (by what time?)	FJTC
<b>Continue in recommend treatment for at least 1 year post-grad.</b>	<b>Post-exit, but no good way to collect</b>	<b>75% achieve. May not continue as a measure for post-graduation.</b>	<b>If data are collected, would have to be FJTC.</b>
<b>Post-grad, use adult mentor for at least one year</b>	<b>Post-exit, but no good way to collect</b>	<b>60% achieve. May not continue as a measure for post-graduation.</b>	<b>If data are collected, would have to be FJTC.</b>
Number of referrals during program participation.	On-going; reported at exit	Also, type of charge	JOMIS
Number of referrals for one year after program participation.	Post-exit, one year	Also, type of charge	JOMIS
Number of admissions to jail during program	On-going; reported at exit	Reason for admit	APSIN
Number of admissions to jail after program	Post-exit, one year	Reason for admit	APSIN
Number of detention days: sanctions	On-going; reported at exit	Reason for sanction	JOMIS
Number of detention days: new offenses	On-going; reported at exit	Type of new offense	JOMIS
Not referred for the same / worse crime during program	On-going; reported at exit	50% of participants achieve this	JOMIS
Not referred for any crime during program	On-going; reported at exit	40% of participants achieve this	JOMIS
Not arrested or referred for any crime at least one year post program	Post-exit, one year	65% of graduates achieve this; no measure stated for non-graduating participants	JOMIS; APSIN
Not arrested or referred for same / worse crime at least one year post program	Post-exit, one year	75% of graduates achieve this; no measure stated for non-graduating participants	JOMIS; APSIN
Increased length of time until subsequent arrest/referral	Post-exit, one year	Survival analysis	JOMIS

**Table 4  
Possible Performance Measures: Fairbanks Juvenile Treatment Court**

<i>Name of measure</i>	<i>Who proposed</i>	<i>Other</i>	<i>Proposed Data Source</i>
Improve mental health	Measured at intake and exit using standard assessments	Needs to be quantified or measurable	FJTC
Decrease substance abuse	Measured at intake and exit using standard assessments	Needs to be quantified or measurable	FJTC
Shorter stays in detention	Compare one year before; during program; one year after	Pre-post comparisons	JOMIS
Fewer returns to detention	Compare one year before; during program; one year after	Pre-post comparisons	JOMIS
Improved family situation	Measured at intake and exit using standard assessments ?		FJTC
Maintain foster care placements/return home	Reported at intake and exit by FJTC staff		FJTC
Reduce number of psychiatric hospital visits		Pre-post comparisons	FJTC
Reduce length of psychiatric hospital stays		Pre-post comparisons	FJTC
Improved housing situation	Reported at intake and exit by FJTC staff	Pre-post comparisons	FJTC
<b>Possible other performance measures, if data become available</b>			
<b>BJA - A Guide to Collecting Mental Health Court Outcome Data (BJA)</b>	<b>Proposed by</b>		
<i>Hospitalizations for physical ills (number, length of stay)</i>	BJA		
<i>Emergency room admits (number and length of stay)</i>	BJA		
<i>Number of days homeless</i>	BJA		
<i>Number of victimizations</i>	BJA		
<i>Level of compliance with medication plan</i>	BJA		
Improve quality of life domains	H&Z, p. ii	AKAIMS measures these	
Increased length of time until subsequent arrest/referral	H&Z, p. 29	Survival analysis	JOMIS
Improved physical health	H&Z, p. 43	Self-reported; AKAIMS	
1. Ability to perform daily activities [in spite of emotional or mental problems]	AKAIMS measure		
2. Social, subsistence, sports, etc. activities in past month	AKAIMS measure		

**Table 4  
Possible Performance Measures: Fairbanks Juvenile Treatment Court**

<i>Name of measure</i>	<i>Who proposed</i>	<i>Other</i>	<i>Proposed Data Source</i>
3. Ability to perform daily activities [in spite of physical health problems]			AKAIMS measure
4. Use of emergency room services in past six months			AKAIMS measure
5. Suicide or hurting self thoughts			AKAIMS measure
6. Alcohol use in past month			AKAIMS measure
7. Illegal drug use, or un-prescribed use of prescribed drugs			AKAIMS measure
8. Support of people in your life for your recovery			AKAIMS measure
10. Receipt of public assistance in past 3 months [this may not be applicable to juveniles?]			AKAIMS measure
11. Frequency of worry about affording basic needs			AKAIMS measure
12. Current housing situation			AKAIMS measure
13. Current involvement with legal system			AKAIMS measure; also JOMIS
14. Feeling of safety in home, school, community			AKAIMS measure
15. Feeling of connectedness, meaning in life, past month			AKAIMS measure
16. Do you have any children under the age of 18?			AKAIMS measure

***Appendix F***  
***Other Issues Mentioned by Stakeholders***



## **Appendix F**

### **Other Issues Mentioned by Stakeholders**

During the course of talking with stakeholders in the Fairbanks Juvenile Treatment Court project, several other issues were mentioned that were not directly relevant to the tasks set for the Judicial Council in this report. They are described here for consideration by the court.

- **Need for Medicaid-approved juvenile substance-abuse treatment:** At the time of the discussions (Mid-September to mid-October 2008), there were no Medicaid-approved substance abuse providers for juveniles in Fairbanks. Although this is a therapeutic court for juveniles with mental health issues, many of the participants will have co-occurring disorders. Some private providers offer service with a sliding scale fee, but not all participants will be able to afford the services. This may be an important issue for the success of the court, and one that evaluators should keep in mind.

Medicaid and other funding issues in general may affect the ability of critical features of the FJTC to function as designed. Future evaluators should attempt to discover what role(s) they have played in the success or failure of the program.

- **Mental health professional on each Multi-disciplinary team:** One of the stronger recommendations made during the planning for the FJTC was that a mental health professional should be on each Multi-Disciplinary Team for each participant. At present, a mental health professional is not a member of the MDT. Not all similar courts have had a person to fill this role either, in large part because of the cost. Questions arise, too, about how often mental health professionals would be used, how they would be chosen, and how they would be compensated.
- **Substance abuse assessment for 100% of participants:** The judge associated with the program believed that the program objective, “50% of the youth . . . will utilize substance abuse and mental health services. . .” should be revised to include a statement that “100% of the youth should be assessed for substance abuse.” Substance abuse assessment appeared to be readily available in Fairbanks, from both Medicaid and non-Medicaid providers, and may be relatively easy to add as an aspect of the court.