

Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative Scale-Up: Study of Four States

Submitted to:

Jeffrey Poirier, PhD

Senior Research Associate

Research, Evaluation, Evidence and Data

The Annie E. Casey Foundation

February 28, 2019

© 2019 WestEd. All rights reserved. Permission to reproduce with WestEd copyright is hereby granted. For more information, email permissions@wested.org

Suggested citation: Guckenburg, S., Stern, A., Sutherland, H., Lopez, G. & Petrosino, A. (2019). *Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative Scale-Up: Study of Four States*. San Francisco, CA: WestEd.

WestEd is a nonpartisan, nonprofit research, development, and service agency that works with education and other communities throughout the United States and abroad to promote excellence, achieve equity, and improve learning for children, youth, and adults. WestEd has more than a dozen offices nationwide, from Massachusetts, Vermont, Georgia, and Washington, DC, to Arizona and California, with headquarters in San Francisco.

The WestEd Justice & Prevention Research Center highlights the rigorous research and evaluation work that WestEd researchers are conducting in the areas of school safety, violence and crime prevention, juvenile and criminal justice, and public health. In addition to conducting research and evaluation studies, a primary goal of the center is to become a trusted source of evidence on the effects of policies and programs in these areas. For more information, visit <http://jprc.wested.org>.



Acknowledgments

We would like to thank the staff at the Annie E. Casey Foundation for facilitating our outreach to the participants who were interviewed for this study. We would also like to thank all those who took the time to talk with us or participate in the survey, share their experience, and reflect on their knowledge and understanding of the Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative®.

Disclaimer

The Annie E. Casey Foundation funded this evaluation. However, the findings and conclusions presented in this report are those of the authors alone.

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction -----	1
a.	Lessons From Other Juvenile Justice Reform Efforts -----	2
b.	Summary of Scale-Up Study -----	2
c.	Summary of Recommendations -----	4
II.	Overview of JDAI Implementation and Scale-Up-----	5
a.	History of JDAI in the Four States -----	6
b.	Previous Studies of JDAI -----	8
c.	Lessons Learned From Other Juvenile Justice Initiatives -----	8
III.	Study Design-----	10
a.	Questions -----	10
b.	Data Collection and Sample -----	10
c.	Data Analysis -----	14
d.	Limitations -----	14
IV.	Study Findings-----	15
	Question 1: How do each state’s juvenile justice system structure, history, motivation, and leadership influence the JDAI scale-up process?-----	15
	Question 2: In what ways and to what extent have sites implemented the eight JDAI core strategies to move JDAI to scale?-----	23
	Question 3: What are the biggest successes, challenges, and lessons learned from the scale-up process in the four states?-----	27
	Interviewee and Survey Respondents’ Recommendations-----	38
V.	Conclusion -----	40
	References -----	41
	Appendix A: Interview Protocols -----	44
	Casey Foundation JDAI Interview Protocol-----	44
	JDAI State Coordinator Interview Protocol -----	46
	State and Local Stakeholder Interview Protocol-----	48
	New Jersey Model Site JDAI Interview Protocol -----	50
	Appendix B: Survey -----	52

I. Introduction

The Annie E. Casey Foundation (Casey) partnered with the WestEd Justice & Prevention Research Center to develop a study of the implementation of the Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative® (JDAI) in four states: Indiana, Massachusetts, Missouri, and New Mexico. JDAI® is a complex, multipart reform initiative developed by Casey to reduce reliance on the use of detention for low-risk young people in the juvenile justice system prior to disposition.¹ The initiative is defined by eight core strategies — a combination of principles and priorities for reform — that drive its implementation (Casey, 2018):

- 1) Collaboration
- 2) Data use
- 3) Objective admissions decisions
- 4) Alternatives to detention
- 5) Expedited case processing
- 6) Special detention cases
- 7) Conditions of confinement
- 8) Reduction of racial and ethnic disparities

Casey has worked closely with local jurisdictions and states across the country since the 1990s to implement the initiative and bring it to scale. The study that is the focus of this report aimed to document how states have scaled JDAI with quality,² to summarize the lessons learned from JDAI implementation both in and across states, and to generate findings that can inform practice and future scale-up of JDAI and other complex juvenile justice reform initiatives.

The report is organized into the following sections:

1. An overall introduction, including lessons learned from other juvenile justice reform efforts and a summary of study findings and recommendations
2. The context of JDAI implementation, including the history of JDAI in each of the study states and findings from previous studies of JDAI
3. The study design, including study questions, site selection, samples, data collection, and analysis, and limitations
4. Study findings on how the structure of JDAI has influenced scale-up, the implementation of the eight core strategies, and the successes, challenges, and lessons learned from scaling JDAI
5. A concluding section that ends with reflections on the findings and application of JDAI principles as scale-up efforts take place in these states

¹ Disposition proceedings in juvenile court are analogous to sentencing hearings in adult court, with some key differences reflecting the juvenile justice system's focus on rehabilitation.

² There is no agreed-upon definition for scale in the social and medical sciences (Fixsen, Blase, Metz, & Van Dyke, 2013). Researchers have described successfully scaled initiatives with phrases like “equitable reach” (Edwards & Barker, 2014, p. S158) and “population-level improvement in social problems” (Supplee & Metz, 2015, p. 2). Coburn (2003, p. 4) proposes a definition of scale that captures the multiple “dimensions” of successful reforms. These dimensions include the depth of changes to practitioner beliefs, norms, and values; the sustainability of those changes; their spread across organizations and systems; and the shift in reform ownership to local leaders and practitioners. In this study, each interviewee and survey respondent was allowed to define scale based on his or her own experiences with JDAI.

a. Lessons From Other Juvenile Justice Reform Efforts

The literature on implementation of other complex juvenile justice reform efforts offers a set of implementation lessons that JDAI can benefit from and that JDAI has experienced in the efforts to bring the initiative to scale. Key lessons from evaluations of Models for Change and Reclaiming Futures include the following:

- Initiatives are most likely to be successful when their implementation and scale-up are driven by the state’s own agenda rather than being imposed on the state by a funder.
- Funders and states benefit from efforts to rigorously document and evaluate statewide initiatives from the beginning of the implementation process (Stevens et al., 2016).
- There is value in pausing to bring together practitioners during the implementation process (Nissen & Merrigan, 2011). States and funders should give practitioners regular opportunities to work together to overcome barriers, reflect on practices, and learn from each other.
- Using data, however imperfect, to track program activities and outcomes is important to implementation and facilitates ongoing improvement (Nissen & Merrigan, 2011).
- For practitioners, the implementation of a new model for practice or policy reform is typically one of many different processes that they are managing at the same time. States, funders, and practitioners benefit from the intentional coordination and integration of these efforts (Nissen & Merrigan, 2011).

Casey has integrated similar principles in the approach, support, and guidance given to states around JDAI scale-up. They are reflected in aspects of the JDAI technical assistance process, the use of JDAI model site visits, the development of the eight core strategies, and the emphasis on institutionalizing JDAI within local and state juvenile justice systems to sustain JDAI core values and strategies as “the way states do business.” Like other states working to bring JDAI to scale, the four states that are the subjects of this study have relied on Casey’s framework to scaffold their efforts.

b. Summary of Scale-Up Study

The study that is the focus of this report examined three questions about how states experience the process of JDAI scale-up. The first of these questions asks how each state’s juvenile justice system structure, history, motivation, and leadership influenced the scale-up process. The second question directed researchers to focus on how sites implemented the eight JDAI core strategies to move JDAI to scale. The final question focused on examining how respondents viewed their biggest successes, challenges, and lessons learned from the scale-up process. Although respondents in this study come from a variety of professional backgrounds and represent multiple roles within JDAI, the information that they shared illustrates several important commonalities across the four study states.

Regardless of whether the state manages the system of detention and juvenile courts or whether the system is managed locally, all four states have been intentional about coordinating state and local efforts to scale-up JDAI. One factor that has supported scale-up in multiple states is the presence of a local champion of JDAI, such as a judge, to help spread the word and motivate

counties and cities to be part of the reform efforts. State leadership and collaboration among various state agencies were also key elements in supporting the scale-up of JDAI.

There were also challenges to scaling JDAI that were related to the balance between state and local control over local implementation of JDAI. State-level interviewees reflected that local policy changes and adoption of new tools, such as a screening tool, are more successful when local counties come to those decisions on their own. Local differences between jurisdictions have also posed challenges for states seeking to apply the same approach to different regions. For example, lack of access to services is often a challenge for rural counties with low population densities. State-level infrastructure for JDAI governance is necessary to support JDAI's expansion to new jurisdictions, but it has sometimes been difficult for states to develop effective state-level governance and staffing structures at a pace that matches JDAI's growth.

Collaboration is the core JDAI strategy that interviewees across states most often reported implementing with success. Specifically, interviewees highlighted collaboration between and within state and local agencies as important successes in their efforts to bring JDAI to scale. Interviewees in some states said they collaborated prior to JDAI, whereas others said it was JDAI that fostered this approach. Other strategies successfully implemented by the states are improving conditions of confinement and utilizing detention screening tools to guide admissions decisions.

Interviewees' experiences with other JDAI core strategies were more mixed. Some identified the expansion of alternatives to detention as an area of success in their states, whereas others thought there was still work to do. Separately, multiple interviewees across states described stakeholders as taking steps to reduce racial and ethnic disparities, but some states are addressing the issue more fully than others, and interviewees in every state indicated that there is more work to do in this area. Finally, many in the four states also considered expedited case processing a challenge to implement, particularly when it is a shared responsibility across multiple departments rather than being handled within just one department.

Interviewees discussed a number of challenges around JDAI scale-up relating to staff and organizational capacity. For example, some states reflected they did not consistently have the personnel or funding required for JDAI implementation. States and local JDAI sites also continue to work toward engagement of key stakeholders. For example, in some counties, interviewees reported that crucial partners, such as law enforcement or schools, were missing from important discussions. Survey respondents most commonly identified community members, local district attorneys, and substance use professionals as absent from JDAI leadership teams.

Interviewees highlighted effective leadership — by both individuals and organizations — as a key component of JDAI scale-up. Individuals in every state described how judicial leadership has, at its best, promoted change and generated buy-in for reforms. Similarly, many interviewees described how visionary and collaborative leadership by state and local government agencies, particularly probation departments, has been successful in advancing reforms. However, the reliance on individual leaders to accumulate knowledge about the initiative, develop a network of relationships, and otherwise drive reforms continues to be a hurdle in some sites vulnerable to

staff turnover, though some are making progress. Specifically, administration changes and staff turnover can set states back in their efforts to scale-up JDAI. Respondents also reported struggling to negotiate and define the relationships between state and local leaders. For example, although state judiciaries can be effective proponents of JDAI, some interviewees reported that local judges have resisted their attempts to influence local practices.

Interviewees also largely reported collaboration with Casey as a success and a relationship that played an important role in scale-up. For example, interviewees described how Casey helped their states identify strategies and funding and develop staffing structures. When identifying what has been successful in JDAI scale-up, states talked about outcomes. Interviewees in every state pointed to lower rates of detention for youth as a success, but also noted there was still much work to be done, especially to address racial and ethnic disparities. Finally, success of scale-up efforts is seen in the expansion to counties that are new to the process and in counties' aim to reform their practices to align with JDAI principles.

Data use is another area in which all four states have experienced significant success as well as challenges. Interviewees across states reported that the implementation of validated instruments for risk assessment and the use of data to identify trends and patterns in use of youth detention have been important successes for their states and local jurisdictions. At the same time, data quality is inconsistent, and many respondents reported struggling to cope with data systems that may be inadequate for their needs or are incompatible with data systems used by other government agencies or jurisdictions in their states. Even in jurisdictions that have good data available, respondents often described challenges with how to use data to ask and answer questions, ownership of the data, data sharing, and decisions about how best to present and report data to key stakeholders and the public.

c. Summary of Recommendations

Describing what they would specifically recommend to states scaling up JDAI, most interview and survey responses were in one of six categories: leadership, collaboration, messaging, data use, stakeholder engagement, and the pace of scale-up. These recommendations include:

1. **Leadership:** Involve judiciary leadership early in the JDAI scale-up effort. Judicial leadership is particularly effective in advancing JDAI's goals and building buy-in at the state and local levels.
2. **Collaboration:** Include strategies that foster collaboration among stakeholders in the scale-up effort. Collaboration and shared decision-making are important for JDAI scale-up. Be sure to facilitate collaboration between the justice system and other branches of government to support JDAI.
3. **Messaging:** To build broad buy-in and engage different stakeholder groups, use clear messaging and communications about what JDAI is and how it improves outcomes for youth.
4. **Data use:** To facilitate access to quality data for decision-making and outcome-tracking, incorporate plans for data collection, management, and use at the beginning of any scale-up efforts.
5. **Stakeholder engagement:** Develop a strong state-level collaborative that, although it likely includes judicial leadership, is inclusive of a diverse group — from key

government stakeholders to local community members, youth, and families — that participates actively in both decision-making and ongoing messaging efforts.

6. **Pace of scale-up:** Match the rate of growth and scale-up to a state’s capacity to build infrastructure supports for JDAI to endure growth, engagement, and sustainability.

II. Overview of JDAI Implementation and Scale-Up

In 1992, Casey created JDAI to help jurisdictions around the country reduce their overreliance on secure predisposition detention for young people. The JDAI approach is based on the early success of the Broward Detention Initiative, one of Casey’s previous grantees. That initiative not only changed juvenile detention practices and detention numbers in Broward County (Fort Lauderdale, FL) but also changed the culture of the juvenile justice system in that jurisdiction. This early work and the experience of sites implementing JDAI led to the development of the eight core strategies that define JDAI today: (1) promoting collaboration, (2) using data to guide decision-making, (3) utilizing objective admissions assessments, (4) expanding alternatives to detention, (5) expediting case processing, (6) reducing special detention cases, (7) improving conditions of confinement, and (8) reducing racial and ethnic disparities (Casey, 2018).

As of 2018, JDAI has been replicated in more than 300 local jurisdictions across at least 39 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico (communication with Casey staff, 2018; Casey, 2014a). A review of U.S. juvenile justice reforms in 2013 conducted by the National Research Council describes JDAI as “perhaps the most widely replicated reform initiative since the passage of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974” (National Research Council, 2013, p. 254).

Over the years, Casey has adjusted how it has worked to disseminate JDAI and how it has interacted with JDAI sites, shifting from what might be described as “making it happen” to “helping it happen” (see Greenhalgh, Robert, MacFarlane, Bate, & Kyriakidou, 2004). Initially, it provided funding to five county-level jurisdictions (demonstration sites) that agreed to adopt JDAI. Each of these sites (Cook County, IL; Milwaukee County, WI; Multnomah County, OR; New York, NY; and Sacramento, CA) was awarded a planning grant and “was eligible for up to \$2.25 million over three years” (Casey, 1999c). Casey also contributed financially to the expansion of the Broward County Initiative to three more Florida sites, with the hope that Florida would eventually integrate JDAI principles into juvenile detention systems statewide (Casey, 2001).³

However, this level of funding was not sustainable at scale. When Casey began replicating JDAI outside Florida, it initially decided to fund jurisdictions on a case-by-case basis; ultimately, however, it prioritized states with multiple sites prepared to adopt JDAI (Casey, 2014a). This approach has enabled Casey to increase the efficiency of its technical assistance delivery and to more easily provide targeted, “state-specific” support for JDAI sites (Casey, 2009). Later replication sites have not been offered substantial funding to implement JDAI, but they have been provided with extensive technical assistance and opportunities to connect with Casey’s network of existing JDAI sites (Casey, 2014a). Casey has also invested in an effort to gather data

³ This attempt to scale the Broward County Initiative (the basis for the JDAI model) statewide in Florida was initially unsuccessful. However, Florida has since adopted JDAI at five sites across the state (Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, 2017).

and to document practices and successes from jurisdictions that have implemented JDAI. Casey has also collaborated with federal and state funding partners to support the sustainability of the work. For example, a recent partnership between Casey and the federal Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention resulted in \$1.5 million in federal grants for ongoing JDAI expansion efforts over three years (Casey, 2014a).

In 2012, Casey began planning the growth of JDAI to include what it calls the “Deep End” of the juvenile justice system. Although JDAI has historically focused on reducing secure detention of youth pre-adjudication,⁴ this new area of reform within JDAI has the additional goal of reducing the use of out-of-home placements after disposition, especially for youth of color. The Deep End initiative is guided by a set of six values: collaboration; data-driven policy and practice; racial and ethnic equity and inclusion; youth development; family engagement; and defense advocacy. As of 2018, New Jersey has been added as a Deep End site, and it is spearheading the work of bringing this relatively new initiative to statewide scale. Three of the four states included in this study also have jurisdictions participating as Deep End sites: Indiana (Marion County), Missouri (St. Louis), and New Mexico (Bernalillo County).

a. History of JDAI in the Four States

This section provides a basic overview of JDAI in each of the four study states: Indiana, Massachusetts, Missouri, and New Mexico. Each state has a unique history implementing JDAI. The information provided in each summary varies based on what is publicly available.

Indiana. JDAI was first implemented in Marion County (Indianapolis) in 2006, and in the intervening years, it has expanded to 32 of the state’s 92 counties, which represents 70 percent of Indiana’s youth population (aged 10 through 17) (Rush, Rucker, David, Massa, & Slaughter, 2016). In 2010, the Indiana Department of Corrections, the Indiana Crime and Justice Institute, and the Indiana Supreme Court came together to scale JDAI statewide (Chief Justice Earl Warren Institute, 2012; Casey, 2014a). Statewide scale-up began with the growth of the statewide JDAI steering committee and included training sessions, system assessments, technical assistance addressing disproportionate rates of minority confinement, and a \$4.5 million appropriation by the Indiana state legislature for the state’s JDAI sites. As of 2014, Indiana was funding a state JDAI coordinator, detention strategists, and data and administrative support for JDAI (Casey, 2014a). As of 2010, Indiana’s first JDAI site — Marion County, which then represented 13 percent of Indiana’s juvenile population — had recorded a drop in the average daily detention population of 35 percent (Chief Justice Earl Warren Institute, 2012). Since 2013, Marion County has been one of the six pilot sites for Casey’s Deep End initiative, the goal of which is to reduce out-of-home placements following disposition (Casey, 2014b).

Massachusetts. Worcester County and Suffolk County (Boston) began implementing JDAI in 2006. Massachusetts adopted JDAI with the intention of scaling it statewide, and at present all six of the state’s judicial districts (out of 11 total) with juvenile detention centers participate in JDAI. A statewide Governance Committee and six subcommittees help to drive cross-site work, which is coordinated by the Massachusetts Department of Youth Services (Executive Office of

⁴ Youth who are tried in juvenile court are subject to adjudication by a juvenile court judge. Adjudication is a judge’s decision about whether or not a young person has committed a delinquent act.

Health and Human Services, 2017). However, as of 2014, “none of the regions ... offer[ed] a full continuum of detention options” (Bernstein, 2014, p. 15). The number of juvenile arrests in Massachusetts dropped by 62 percent between 2002 and 2012 (Bernstein, 2014). As of 2010, JDAI sites in the state had recorded a 37 percent decrease in average daily detention populations since 2006 and a 33 percent decrease in use of long-term detention over the same period. In comparison, the state overall saw a 45 percent reduction in detention (predisposition) and a 30 percent reduction in commitments (postdisposition) to a juvenile correctional facility over the same period (Chief Justice Earl Warren Institute, 2012).

Missouri. In 2006, Jackson County (Kansas City), Greene County (Springfield), the city of St. Louis, and St. Louis County became the first jurisdictions in Missouri to implement JDAI. By 2018, the initiative had expanded to 16 of the 17 circuits in Missouri that had juvenile detention centers, as well as to two additional circuits that do not have detention centers, for a total expansion of 18 JDAI sites (Casey, 2014a). The Missouri Office of State Courts Administrator, Department of Public Safety, and State Advisory Group for juvenile justice came together in 2009 to seek federal funding for detention reform in Missouri. In 2010, the Missouri JDAI Replication Workgroup began scaling JDAI statewide, with early scaling activities including the provision of grant funding to new and existing JDAI sites (Casey, 2014a). As of 2012, the state provided supports that included “a statewide data collection system for youth in the justice system” (Chief Justice Earl Warren Institute, 2012, p. 73). Today all juvenile courts in Missouri are mandated to use a standardized detention assessment tool (Casey, 2014a). The city of St. Louis became a Deep End pilot site in 2013.

Between 2006 and 2010, Missouri was one of two states that saw a larger decrease in arrests overall than was documented among its JDAI sites (5 percent compared with 1 percent). The state’s (then five) JDAI sites reported an overall drop of 45 percent in average daily population in juvenile detention during the same period of time (Chief Justice Earl Warren Institute, 2012). These changes suggest that both JDAI and non-JDAI counties were making progress in reducing the number of youth being arrested during this time period and that JDAI sites were becoming less reliant on the use of detention for youth who were arrested.

New Mexico. Bernalillo County became a JDAI site in 1999 and a Deep End pilot site in 2013 (Swisstack, Mitchell, & Leyba, 2011; Casey, 2014b). Bernalillo County is also a JDAI model site. Since 1999, JDAI has expanded to four additional sites — Dona Ana County, Lea County, San Juan County, and Santa Fe County — which, together with Bernalillo County, represented 56 percent of the state’s youth population as of 2010 (Chief Justice Earl Warren Institute, 2012). New Mexico adopted JDAI statewide in 2003 and passed legislation that required screening for detention. In 2007, the New Mexico Children’s Code was designed to incorporate the initiative’s eight core strategies by formalizing key system processes and standards around case processing, petition filing, legal representation, specification of cause for detention, use of a validated risk assessment tool, and decision-making by probation staff. Since 2012, the state has expanded JDAI to seven counties. The state has also made policy changes to better support delinquent youth who need mental health treatment and directed state funding to county-level alternatives to detention (Chief Justice Earl Warren Institute, 2012).

From 2003 to 2010, detention increased statewide by 29 percent and, in one JDAI site (Santa Fe), by 33 percent. However, among JDAI sites, the average daily number of youth in detention decreased by 41 percent (Chief Justice Earl Warren Institute, 2012). Since adopting JDAI, Bernalillo County has been able to close part of its secure juvenile detention facility, reassigning some of its officers to one of two detention alternatives in the area (Casey, 2009).

b. Previous Studies of JDAI

To inform the study of these four states, it was important to understand the history of JDAI implementation and also to learn how JDAI has been previously studied or evaluated. There has not yet been a rigorous independent evaluation of either the JDAI implementation process or the initiative's effect on youth or community outcomes. However, Casey has funded efforts to compile outcomes data for JDAI sites and states (see Chief Justice Earl Warren Institute, 2012), and it has published a series of briefs and reports on JDAI. Each of these publications cites a combination of quantitative and qualitative data provided to Casey by local JDAI sites. A few themes stand out from these summaries of the JDAI implementation experience. These themes include the importance of:

- **Development of stakeholder buy-in.** Bringing JDAI to scale has typically depended on a combination of active state-level support and local control. Encouraging collaboration has been key in achieving these goals (Casey, 1999a; Casey, 2001; Casey, 2014a).
- **Leadership.** Local sites and statewide expansion efforts alike need effective, credible leaders who are committed to driving reform (Casey, 2001; Casey, 2014a).
- **Investment in understanding context and preparing for implementation.** Implementation of JDAI has benefited from thoughtful planning and assessment of the environment in which reform will take place (Casey, 2001; Casey, 1999c; Casey, 1999a).
- **Deliberate timing.** Scaling JDAI has been successful where expansion has been a slow, careful effort with many early opportunities to change course, adapt, and draw support through small victories (Casey, 1999a; Casey, 2014a).
- **Infrastructure.** JDAI, like other complex reform initiatives, does best when there is a strong set of supporting resources and policies in place to facilitate reform (Casey, 2014a; Casey, 1999a; Casey, 1999c).
- **Goal setting.** It has been important for JDAI sites and states to identify unambiguous and agreed-upon goals and values for reform prior to the decision to undertake implementation (Casey, 1999a; Casey, 2001; Casey, 1999c).

c. Lessons Learned From Other Juvenile Justice Initiatives

Reviewing the literature on other juvenile justice reform efforts, including how implementation has been documented and the challenges shared by other reform efforts, helped set the stage for understanding JDAI implementation in the four study states. For example, one of the main findings of this review is that few juvenile justice reform efforts have invested in documenting the process of implementation or in making that information public. When information about implementation is available, it is typically incidental to a description of program components or evaluation; limited in terms of detail; and presented in a way that is either so program-specific or so vague that generalizing best practices to other implementation efforts is difficult. Reform initiatives that are comparable to JDAI in terms of complexity and scale rarely discuss implementation at all from the perspective of concern with quality. However, among those juvenile justice efforts for which such documentation exists or the authors draw their own

conclusions based on what they know about the implementation experience, there is a striking level of commonality. This literature more broadly echoes the findings of both the JDAI literature and the implementation theory and research, indicating potential challenges, best practices, and key considerations that are likely to resonate with many implementation efforts — regardless of those efforts’ scale, scope, complexity, or approach.

For example, a 2016 evaluation of Models for Change, a broad-based juvenile justice reform effort spearheaded by the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, identified several factors that were correlated with the reach, sustainability, and spread of juvenile justice reforms. It found that Models for Change has been successful in part because of its use of multiple strategies to effect reform. The evaluation reported that the strengths of the initiative were those strategies dictated by the state’s own agenda and not those imposed by the MacArthur Foundation. Evaluators also identified the production of “credible evidence about problems and solutions” as an important strategy employed by the Models for Change states (Stevens et al., 2016, p. xiii). However, individuals interviewed for the evaluation commented that the initiative did not prioritize the rigorous evaluation of policies and practices implemented in the core Models for Change states. This shortcoming was perceived as a “missed opportunity” for the initiative to develop evidence supporting effective juvenile justice reforms aligned with its key philosophy (Stevens et al., 2016).

Reclaiming Futures, launched by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation in 2001, is another large-scale juvenile justice reform effort whose implementation experience may be relevant to JDAI. A 2011 study of the initiative’s dissemination and expansion identified several “key lessons” that the authors suggested were “likely common in the work of other systems change efforts” (Nissen & Merrigan, 2011, p. S13). The first of these findings is that, although an implementation effort to maintain forward momentum is important, there are advantages to providing practitioners with opportunities to work together in overcoming barriers, iterating, and reflecting on their practice. Specifically, the process acted as a coaching opportunity and helped practitioners “feel themselves changing as a result of the work they were doing,” which suggests an integration of the model that exceeds mere adoption (Nissen & Merrigan, 2011, p. S13).

Another critical lesson of the Reclaiming Futures experience is the importance of “connect[ing] logic frameworks to progress indicators” (Nissen & Merrigan, 2011, p. S13). In other words, it is essential to use available data, however imperfect, to track program activities and outcomes over time from the start of the implementation process. Like the learning community model, this strategy facilitates ongoing quality improvement and staff investment in the program. Finally, Nissen and Merrigan (2011, p. S14) make what seems like an obvious point that offers important perspective on the experience of the implementation team on the ground. They write that although “funders tend to see initiatives as singular and focused,” for implementers at the site level, an initiative like Reclaiming Futures is just one of many different processes to be managed simultaneously. At best, interacting initiatives and reforms can build on each other. Without intentional coordination and integration, though, these competing activities can “cause ... pockets of reform” and even “fragmentation of services.”

These findings helped inform the data collection for this study by helping the researchers develop questions targeting how JDAI sites navigated the effort to scale up at the state level and

how states have managed challenges, including those relating to state and local resources, political and cultural context, clarity of goals, and competing activities that the literature indicates can affect implementation.

III. Study Design

The study design and data collection tools were informed by the findings from the history of JDAI, implementation of JDAI, and lessons from other juvenile justice reform efforts. These earlier findings helped focus this study's questions about state structure, leadership, stakeholder involvement, sustainability, capacity, and implementation. Previous reviews of other complex juvenile justice reform initiatives have highlighted the need for more detailed documentation of local and state-level implementation processes. This study is designed to help fill this gap for JDAI by gathering information about local and state-level implementation of the initiative, with an emphasis on understanding the dynamic nature of relationships among stakeholders, the political and cultural environment in which the work takes place, and the overall capacity of each state to take on large-scale, complex reforms to its juvenile justice system. This section describes the approach, methods, and limitations to conducting the study, including summarizing the data collection, the study sample, and the approach to data analysis.

a. Questions

Question 1: How do each state's juvenile justice system structure, history, motivation, and leadership influence the JDAI scale-up process?

Question 2: In what ways and to what extent have sites implemented the eight JDAI core strategies to move JDAI to scale?

Question 3: What are the biggest successes, challenges, and lessons learned from the scale-up process in the four states?

For all questions, researchers examined common themes emerging across the four study states.

b. Data Collection and Sample

Sites were selected with the assistance of Casey staff. Data collection consisted of a document review, in-depth semi structured interviews, and a survey of JDAI stakeholders.

Site Selection

The states that participated in the study — Indiana, Massachusetts, Missouri, and New Mexico — have each implemented JDAI at the state level and locally. They were chosen in conjunction with the Casey Foundation because the states varied in terms of their history with JDAI and their implementation story, providing unique experiences and perspectives that could inform lessons learned and best practices for the field. Casey considers three of the states — Indiana, Massachusetts, and Missouri — advanced in their efforts to scale up statewide. Casey defined this status as having a heavy organization at the state level to support scale-up. Table 1 summarizes variation in other key domains across the four states.

Table 1. Site Characteristics

	Indiana	Massachusetts	Missouri	New Mexico
Advanced statewide scale-up	✓	✓	✓	
Origin of JDAI (state or local level)	Local	State	State	Local
Year JDAI began	Marion County: 2006 State level: 2013	2006	2006	Bernalillo County: 1999 State level: 2003
Management of juvenile detention centers	Local	State	Local	Local
Agency leading state-level JDAI implementation ⁵	Indiana Supreme Court	Department of Youth Services	Administrative Office of the Courts	Children's Cabinet (probation and detention are functions)
Local Deep End site ⁶	✓		✓	✓
Geographic location	Midwest	Northeast	Midwest	Southwest
Racial/ethnic diversity of the state's urban and rural juvenile detention population	Rural: majority White Urban: majority Black	Rural: majority White Urban: majority Black	Rural: majority White Urban: majority Black	Urban and rural: majority Latino

The four study states are located in the Midwest, Northeast, and Southwest regions of the United States. Populations in Indiana, Massachusetts, and Missouri share similar racial and ethnic makeup, with rural areas having a primarily White population and urban areas having a greater proportion of Black residents. All four states have been implementing JDAI at a local level, if not a state level, for at least 10 years. Although New Mexico was among the first adopters of JDAI, it is the only one of the four states that has not experienced full statewide scale-up. JDAI was first implemented at a local level in both New Mexico and Indiana. In contrast, Massachusetts and Missouri made the decision to scale JDAI statewide before beginning to implement the initiative in local jurisdictions. In all states, the state judiciary is a key leadership

⁵ There may be multiple agencies collaborating with the listed agency in leading JDAI implementation, for example, Indiana Supreme Court collaborates with Department of Correction, Criminal Justice Institute, Department of Child Services, Division of Mental Health and Addiction, and the Department of Education.

⁶ Casey launched its Deep End initiative in 2012, with the goal of reducing out-of-home placements for youth postdisposition (Casey, 2017b).

partner in JDAI. Indiana, Missouri, and New Mexico are engaged in Casey’s Deep End initiative, in addition to JDAI.

Document Review

For this study, researchers requested and reviewed Casey-held documents specific to JDAI, including materials used by technical assistance providers and state-specific materials. Google searches were also conducted to identify any relevant documents. JDAI state websites and the JDAI technical assistance website were also reviewed for material, history, and relevant data. The documents were used to inform the study in each state and supplement the interviews. Examples of documents the research team reviewed that were especially informative to the overall principles and model of JDAI as well as how states implemented JDAI include:

- [JDAI in New Jersey: A Statewide Replication Success Story — And Lessons for Taking JDAI Statewide](#) (Casey, 2014a)
- [JDAI at 25: Insights From the Annual Results Reports](#) (Casey, 2017a)
- A variety of documents provided by the state JDAI coordinators, including strategic plans, presentations of the juvenile justice state systems, and history timelines of JDAI implementation

Interviews

The research team conducted in-depth interviews of key informants at both the state and local levels (from different local jurisdictions across each state). In addition to conducting the state interviews, researchers interviewed Casey’s Juvenile Justice Strategy Group (JJSG) staff and their consultants working in each state. The research team worked closely with Casey and state contacts to identify the appropriate people to interview. All of the study participants who were contacted and asked to participate in an interview were provided a study information form with details about the study, how their data would be used, and the types of products (internal to Casey, as well as those made public) that could result from this study so that each person could make an informed decision about whether or not to participate.

The research team conducted the interviews in stages. The first set of interviews was with JJSG staff and technical assistance providers. The next set of interviews was with the lead JDAI staff person from each of the four states. Researchers asked each of these four leads to recommend 10 to 12 state and local stakeholders from their state to be contacted and asked if they would be willing to participate in an interview (some states identified more stakeholders). An interview protocol was specifically tailored for each type of informant (e.g., state level versus local level, roles of informants) (Appendix A). Data were collected via phone interviews between April 2017 and October 2017. There were five people who either declined to be interviewed or with whom the research team was unable to schedule an interview despite multiple attempts. Table 2 indicates the number of interviews conducted for each stakeholder type.

Table 2. Number of Individuals Interviewed

Stakeholder	Number of Interviewees
Casey staff (or former staff)	3
Technical assistance providers	5
Indiana	17

Stakeholder	Number of Interviewees
Massachusetts	10
Missouri	12
New Mexico	13
Total	60

Survey

In addition to conducting the key informant interviews, the research team implemented a brief online survey with a larger sample of local and state JDAI staff in each of the four study states. The survey consisted of 110 questions, mostly Likert scale and multiple-choice and a few open-ended. A full copy of the survey can be found in Appendix B. The purpose of the survey was to collect information about the implementation of JDAI from a larger sample and capture quantitative data to complement the qualitative interviews. The survey was sent to 131 participants across the four states in October 2017. The number of study participants invited to take the survey varied by state (Table 3). The research team worked with Casey staff as well as JDAI state coordinators to determine the appropriate participants to invite to take the survey in each state. After multiple reminders through December 2017, 73 participants had submitted complete or partial responses, for a 55.7 percent response rate (Tables 3 and 4). Participants could skip questions they didn't want to answer, so some questions had a lower response rate than 55.7 percent. Because of the low response rate, particularly for New Mexico, survey data throughout the report are presented in the aggregate across all four states.

Table 3. Number of Survey Reponses by State

State	Number of Participants Invited to Take the Survey	Number of Survey Responses	Response Rate
Indiana	50	30	60.0%
Massachusetts	34	18	52.9%
Missouri	32	19	59.4%
New Mexico	15	5	33.3%
Did not identify a state	–	1	–
Total	131	73	55.7%

Table 4. Number of Survey Reponses by Stakeholder Type

Stakeholder Type	Survey Responses
State	48
Local	20
Total	68*

*Not all respondents answered the question identifying themselves as a state or local stakeholder, so the total for Table 4 is less than the total reported in Table 3.

Respondents were asked to identify their current role from 15 different categories. The top three categories selected were juvenile justice personnel, local juvenile judge, and “other.” In the

“other” category, respondents mentioned roles such as JDAI coordinator, public defender, advocate, and professor. None of the respondents identified as a district attorney or supreme court judge.

c. Data Analysis

Interviews were conducted over the telephone with the interviewer recording notes. In some cases, the interviews were audio recorded with permission of the interviewee and notes were transcribed later. After the notes were cleaned up, they were uploaded to Dedoose, a web-based application for analyzing qualitative data. The goal for the analysis of interview data was to triangulate the findings using documents and interview findings.

The research team developed a coding system to identify overarching and more specific themes in the data. The coding system was influenced by the key evaluation questions and the core strategies of JDAI. The researchers coded all interview data in Dedoose using codes they generated. The research team used an iterative process to develop the final set of codes. Before completing a preliminary round of coding of all interview data, the team brainstormed a list of codes together, based on the interviews. Next, code frequencies and code co-occurrences were extracted and rank-ordered to get a quantitative understanding of which codes aligned with respondents’ answers most often. Subsequently, the research team conducted a context analysis of the primary codes to identify emergent themes within each code.

d. Limitations

The study approach allowed for an in-depth look at how four sites scaled JDAI. However, as with any study, there are limitations. Although the research team used comprehensive methods to collect data from all the stakeholder groups, resource limitations meant the study could not include all key respondents involved in the four states’ JDAI scale-up efforts. One risk, therefore, is that researchers did not collect data from stakeholders representing all the different perspectives in each of the states. The study team addressed this challenge by working closely with each state to ensure that the team contacted representatives from both local and state efforts to scale JDAI. Despite these efforts, some stakeholders were unable to connect with the research team for an interview or chose not to take the online survey. Researchers also did not interview youth, family, or community members for this study; therefore, these additional perspectives are not reflected in the findings.

Another limitation is the lack of generalizability of findings. The data that were collected and the conclusions drawn from these data are specific to the four states in the study and should not be wholly generalized to other settings. However, the scale-up study can still inform thinking about JDAI scale-up on a national level. The research team believes that the successes and challenges that this study has documented are valuable in contributing to an understanding of the JDAI scale-up experience, and the team believes that they provide important factors to consider as other states and stakeholders examine ways to scale up JDAI in their states.

IV. Study Findings

This section includes the findings and emerging themes across all four states. Quotes are offered to illustrate points or give examples of emerging themes. The section organizes findings by the three evaluation questions.

Question 1: How do each state's juvenile justice system structure, history, motivation, and leadership influence the JDAI scale-up process?

As noted in the review of literature on JDAI, the concept of “scale” or “scale-up” is defined differently by different people. In 2014, Casey released a report detailing New Jersey’s progress in implementing JDAI and becoming a model state. That report defines scale-up as involving the presence of the following elements (Casey, 2014a):

- Replicating the model widely to ensure that it benefits youth in all or nearly all jurisdictions
- Implementing the model fully and with fidelity
- Achieving meaningful results related to the core goals of detention reform
- Ensuring the sustainability of detention reform over the long term

When interviewees for this study talked about “scaling up,” they most often focused on the process of applying the principles, core components, and strategies of JDAI at a state level and the goal of changing policies and practices to affect the majority of youth in the state.

As one technical assistance provider put it, “What I mean [by scaling up] is ... working with jurisdictions to implement JDAI in the counties and to influence state-level policy and practice and align it with the work locally. At the end of the day, trying to permanently change the structure of policies in the juvenile justice system at the local and state level — how they do business and sustain over time.”

Scale-up of JDAI involves both state and local efforts. The same technical assistance provider noted that in some cases, there may be a lot of effort at the state level, but not much happening locally, and in other cases, there is expansion work in the counties but a lack of organizational structure at the state level to align policies and practices. “[The] goal is to [do] both of those things ... because scale methodology is [an] important way to create sustainability at state and local level.”

Casey staff described scale-up less as being about growing and expanding JDAI and more about increasing the role of the state in influencing local practices in the juvenile justice system. Interviewees acknowledged that it is not always natural or historically common for states to get involved in local practices. As one Casey staff person described the process, “How states get involved in local stuff is so hard.” Casey staff also voiced some cautions about bringing JDAI to state scale and explained that it may be more impactful initially to expand to some counties but not others. For example, one staff member said, “We can’t pretend that adding a [JDAI] county ... that doesn’t even have a detention center matters in the same way that it matters in our large jurisdictions. There’s a way that focusing on the state can at times lose the big point even when focusing on important things.”

At the same time, interviews with Casey staff indicate clear reasons for the foundation’s increased emphasis on state-level scale-up of JDAI. Specifically, Casey staff believe that the foundation maximizes its impact by targeting states rather than counties for JDAI implementation. As one person said, “[The] main focus of replication has been the scale states, which is how it ought to be, since there’s no way that Casey can do this individually in 3,000 counties. Changes to this work will require state approaches that demand a partnership with the state and the localities.”

As part of this study’s survey of JDAI stakeholders in Indiana, Massachusetts, Missouri, and New Mexico, respondents were asked two questions about factors influencing JDAI scale-up in their states. Table 5 summarizes survey respondents’ answers to these two questions. Respondents rated all the factors listed as important to scaling up JDAI, both up to this point in time and moving forward in scale-up efforts.

Table 5. Factors Influencing Scale-Up

Factor	How important have the following factors been in the scale-up of JDAI in your state up to this time?	
	“Very Important,” “Important,” or “Moderately Important”	“Very Important,” “Important,” or “Moderately Important”
Access to quality data	100.0% (n=61)	98.5% (n=65)
Advocates	96.7% (n=60)	98.4% (n=63)
Champions of JDAI (local and statewide)	100.0% (n=61)	98.5% (n=65)
Collaboration among statewide agencies and stakeholders	100.0% (n=61)	96.9% (n=65)
Community engagement	96.7% (n=61)	95.4% (n=65)
Executive branch leadership	95.0% (n=60)	92.3% (n=65)
Judicial branch leadership	100.0% (n=61)	100.0% (n=65)
Leadership team	100.0% (n=60)	98.5% (n=63)
Local stakeholder buy-in	100.0% (n=60)	95.4% (n=65)
State stakeholder buy-in	98.4% (n=61)	98.5% (n=65)
Support from the Casey Foundation	96.7% (n=61)	93.9% (n=65)
Other	42.9 (n=7)	10.0% (n=10)

Note: Due to rounding, percentages may not add up to 100%.

The four states have taken different paths to scaling JDAI, with varying results. A recurring theme in the data is the importance of adapting the scale-up process to the unique historical, structural, cultural, and political features of state and local systems. In interviews and survey responses, participants described how their respective states have managed or even leveraged these state and local characteristics, including the structure of the juvenile justice system, the state’s role in local juvenile detention, the relationships between state and local stakeholders and between the different branches of government, and the resources available to support the scale-up process. Notably, research on the implementation and scaling of evidence-based practices often cites similar factors among potential determinants of success (Campie & Sokolsky, 2016; Damschroder et al., 2009). The following section discusses the structure, history, and motivations driving scale-up in the four states.

State Juvenile Justice System Structures

The structure of the juvenile justice system in each state influences how the states have approached scale-up of JDAI. This influence is evident in the experiences of the four states that are the focus of this study. Table 6 summarizes the structural features of the four states.

Table 6. Structural Features of the State Juvenile Justice System

State	Who oversees juvenile detention?	Who oversees juvenile courts?
Indiana	County	County
Massachusetts	State (Department of Youth Services)	State (Juvenile Court Department)
Missouri	Local juvenile and family courts operate juvenile detention centers.	The Missouri Supreme Court oversees the circuit courts, which in turn provide oversight for the local juvenile and family courts.
New Mexico	County	State (Children’s Court)

Of the four states, Massachusetts is the only one that has a state-managed system for detention and juvenile courts. This system presents some challenges for local replication of JDAI in Massachusetts, according to those working on JDAI in the state. Because Massachusetts does not have county governments or county budgets, changes that require funding shifts require movement on the state budget, which is difficult. As far as scaling JDAI at the state level, the structure of Massachusetts’s government did support the scale-up effort. According to those interviewed, “Massachusetts decided around 2010 that being a statewide site made the most sense; we have to convince all of the state partners anyway, so we should try to do more.” According to interviewees, one of the keys to Massachusetts’ scale-up efforts for JDAI is collaboration. Once more people were brought in as part of a collaborative, the local jurisdictions “started to pay attention.” This momentum continues as Massachusetts builds an infrastructure to support JDAI.

For the other three states, a state and local system is in place to support the scale-up of JDAI. However, unique structures set each of these systems apart and affect the scale-up of JDAI in different ways. For example, in Missouri, the juvenile justice system is organized into circuits

that can be made up of individual counties or multiple counties. This unique structure has presented advantages as well as challenges for JDAI. Interviewees reflecting on scale-up of JDAI in Missouri noted that in some ways it went well because of this structure: “This actually helps JDAI because if you make one policy, then everyone has to comply with it. On one level it’s easy because the Office of AOC administration [Office of State Courts Administrator] has oversight over the rules in which the courts function, so if you change one practice, that came down as [a rule] change and can’t be done anymore.”

This structure has also presented challenges for Missouri. Direction from the state level did not always go over well at the local level, according to Missouri interviewees. For example, adoption of an assessment instrument has had more success when counties came to the realization on their own that it was a helpful and useful tool.

Both Indiana and New Mexico started JDAI at the local level and saw early results that were recognized at the state level. However, Indiana has so far expanded more quickly and widely than New Mexico, with a local JDAI structure of local coordinators and committees that mirrors that of the state structure for JDAI. Interviewees identified several state characteristics that may have helped Indiana achieve this success. First, Indiana has a strong judicial champion that has led the efforts to scale JDAI, and by 2013, the lead agencies responsible for JDAI at the state level had received legislative funding for new sites. Second, although Indiana’s juvenile detention and juvenile court systems are locally controlled, a number of counties have been eager to drive reform, and state leadership has encouraged this dynamic.

New Mexico also started JDAI locally. In fact, Bernalillo County is a model JDAI site. However, the success of Bernalillo County has been difficult to replicate at the state level. The structure of the juvenile justice system in New Mexico has been a particular challenge. Detention centers are run at the local level, but certain policies and practices are made at the state level, and getting them embedded in local detention facilities has been difficult. There has also been success at the state level; for example, the eight core JDAI strategies are part of the state code, and there is a statewide detention risk assessment. However, as one interviewee explained, “Putting laws into place doesn’t mean that they are going to be implemented.” In practice, implementation of JDAI reforms outside Bernalillo County has lagged behind JDAI’s institutionalization in state policies. A New Mexico interviewee commented that the state is “still determining the role of the state vis-à-vis local” in the scale-up of JDAI.

Another challenge of scale-up in all four states has been translating the JDAI model from the urban areas where it was first implemented to the more rural areas of the states. Interviewees described several ways in which the low population densities of rural counties have affected implementation of JDAI. For example, interviewees described how it has been difficult to engage stakeholders and develop alternatives to detention in places where there are small numbers of youth being detained. In Indiana, several counties are so sparsely populated that they share a detention center. In at least one case, counties have chosen to take on key areas of reform jointly, such as by convening a multijurisdictional committee to address conditions of confinement. In counties without their own juvenile detention center, police officers have been frustrated by local reforms that discourage them from detaining youth who are arrested because the police have nowhere else to bring them. The solution in one Indiana county has been to

develop intake centers to which officers will be able to bring youth after arrest for assessments and referrals for services. In Massachusetts, interviewees noted the lack of services or stakeholders in the more rural parts of the state to support the implementation of JDAI.

At the same time, state JDAI leaders in multiple states expressed the hope that many smaller, more rural counties are already “JDAI-like” because of exposure to JDAI in adjacent counties. They recognized that JDAI implementation may ultimately look different in more rural areas of the state, including in counties that do not have detention centers. For example, one Indiana interviewee explained that some jurisdictions in Indiana “are already doing some components [of JDAI] regionally” and suggested strategies such as sharing a JDAI coordinator between two or more counties. In New Mexico, one interviewee described seeing more “small communities” beginning to implement JDAI and stated that “sometimes they do things better” than the large urban communities that initially adopted the initiative.

Model Site and JDAI Structure

JDAI has a select number of counties and one state that serve as “model sites.” Being a model site means that other sites from around the country can come and learn from those who have been successful in implementing and scaling JDAI. New Jersey serves as the model state site for JDAI. Other states send staff and stakeholders to New Jersey for a two-day meeting to learn about the practices and structure that support the work of JDAI throughout the state. Attendees of the training discuss challenges and strategize with New Jersey leaders about how to address those challenges. As part of this study, the research team interviewed respondents from the New Jersey state JDAI team and observed a training workshop attended by New Mexico JDAI leaders. As many as 15 state delegations have visited New Jersey to learn from its experience and strategize about how they can apply what New Jersey learned in their local state context.

Key messages from the leadership at the New Jersey meetings that the research team observed include the importance of committed and collaborative leadership, institutionalizing core values of JDAI at the state and local levels, messaging, and sustainability. These messages are also emphasized in Casey’s 2014 report focusing on the JDAI scale-up process in New Jersey (Casey, 2014a). That report documents the main factors that have contributed to New Jersey’s success in implementing JDAI and its status as a model state. The report identifies three contributing factors: determined leadership, timing (obtaining local success and then building and expanding on that), and development of a sturdy infrastructure to support JDAI scale-up and sustainability. The report goes on to identify the key elements of New Jersey’s infrastructure to both sustain and expand JDAI to the different jurisdictions throughout the state.

To analyze the absence or presence of these key elements in the four study states, Table 7 indicates whether a state had that element at the time of this study. The data for this table are based on interviews with state respondents. The one infrastructure feature the four study states share with New Jersey is expertise from the state to support local JDAI sites. The other features varied by state, although three of the four states have a statewide detention-screening instrument and Indiana has county-specific instruments.

Table 7. Key Elements in JDAI Infrastructure, as Defined by JDAI Model State, New Jersey

	Indiana	Massachusetts	Missouri	New Mexico
A standardized first-rate data system	Data system for JDAI sites only		✓	
Expertise from the state to support local JDAI sites	✓	✓	✓	✓
A structured and predictable replication process	✓	✓		
A statewide detention-screening instrument	County specific	✓	✓	✓
Financial support for local detention reform	✓		✓	
Statewide JDAI conferences	✓	✓	✓	

History, Motivation, and Leadership of JDAI

Table 8 summarizes the history and elements of JDAI implementation for each of the states. Several key similarities and differences in the implementation of JDAI across the four states are evident.

All four states, even when intending to implement JDAI statewide, started with one or two counties. This approach made sense given the funding, technical assistance, guidance, and structure of the local juvenile detention system in these four settings. It also enabled sites to experience some success locally before expanding to other local areas or building a state-level infrastructure to support scaling of JDAI.

Although all four states eventually decided to scale JDAI to the state level, each took a different path toward that goal. For Indiana and Massachusetts, timing was critical, and having the right partners involved at the right time is what led to state scale-up. For Missouri, the intention was always to scale JDAI to the state level, but stakeholders first wanted to demonstrate success at the local level. Missouri had a state-level strategy and infrastructure, but JDAI was challenging to implement at a local level. An example of an early challenge for Missouri was mandating the state-level objective admissions tool. The state’s mandate was met with resistance at the local level and, as mentioned earlier, the state found greater success letting local jurisdictions discover on their own that this tool was an improvement over their current tool. As one Casey staff member said, Missouri “had the high strategy, but they also need a low strategy.”

New Mexico started with five pilot sites, mainly in urban areas. The struggle for New Mexico has been collaboration between the state and local agencies to bring JDAI to scale, and turnover of staff has played a large role in that struggle. As one person said, “I have experienced so many administrative changes at state and local level. [It is a] huge struggle to bring on-site when you have new administration constantly turning over and [a] learning curve that starts over.” New

Mexico became reenergized around the idea of scale-up about five years ago and has been trying to recommit to the idea. According to one interviewee, multiple stakeholders, including the counties, the New Mexico Supreme Court, and the Department of Children, Youth, and Families, were brought together by a chief justice to decide to take JDAI to scale. This group of stakeholders has also recently visited JDAI model state New Jersey — the second time New Mexico has sent a delegation there — to learn from that state’s experiences. It was noted at the meeting that this delegation represented an entirely new group of people from New Mexico’s previous visit, which speaks to the issue of turnover for the stakeholders of JDAI in New Mexico.

The four states also vary in their approach to the relationship between the state and local counties. In Indiana, interviewees identified the state’s culture of local control as a particularly important feature to be considered in its scale-up of JDAI. A state interviewee described JDAI as “state-led and locally driven” because local courts “don’t take kindly to the state coming in and saying what to do.” Although Indiana interviewees identified this approach as an important factor in Indiana’s successful scaling of JDAI, it means that it has been necessary to develop buy-in separately with each juvenile court judge and each probation department across the state. Another Indiana interviewee explained that Indiana is different from states like New Jersey in this respect and that “it has been a slight challenge to convey that to the foundation at times.” In an extension of this theme, an Indiana interviewee noted the importance of Casey’s early support for JDAI in Indiana, but recommended that other states rely on local stakeholders to define how JDAI will be brought to scale: “You need people internal to the state ideally to say that ‘This is what JDAI means to you’ before scale.”

Interviewees in other states described finding the balance between state and local control as an ongoing process. For example, in Massachusetts, several interviewees reported a lack of communication and coordination at times between state and local JDAI activities. As one person stated, “[There] is still a disconnect between the state and local.” Similarly, New Mexico interviewees described the state’s JDAI scale-up efforts as a “top-down” approach that has yielded successes in terms of state-level institutionalization of JDAI but has not yet resulted in consistent local implementation of JDAI principles. A Casey interviewee described this challenge as a “struggle with getting sites to do JDAI fully.” New Mexico interviewees varied in how they described this aspect of the scale-up process.

Table 8. History and Elements of JDAI Implementation at the State and Local Levels

	Indiana	Massachusetts	Missouri	New Mexico
Year JDAI started	2006	2006	2006	1999
JDAI started in local counties	✓	✓	✓	✓
JDAI was always intended to go statewide			✓	
Attended New Jersey model state visit	✓	✓	✓	✓

	Indiana	Massachusetts	Missouri	New Mexico
Has statewide coordinator in place	✓	✓	✓	✓
Has statewide collaborative	✓	✓	✓	✓
Has local coordinators in place	✓	✓	✓	✓ (one in Bernalillo County)
Total number of local JDAI sites	32	6	18	9

Significantly, conversations with interviewees in Indiana, Massachusetts, Missouri, and New Mexico, as well as with Casey staff and technical assistance providers, indicated that leadership is key in bringing JDAI to scale. This finding is echoed in New Jersey’s experience of bringing JDAI to scale (Casey, 2014a). In each of the four states in this study, respondents spoke about how important their JDAI state coordinator is to the scale-up and implementation of JDAI. In Massachusetts and Indiana, the state leadership structure, with a coordinator and committee, is similar at the local level. This infrastructure is new for Massachusetts, which recently hired another local JDAI coordinator.

Diverse representation of partners in leadership was also discussed in the interviews as an important foundation for success. Key partners need to be present and working together to facilitate JDAI scale-up. As one person said, “Without a broad and diverse collaborative of leaders, you only get so far in scale efforts.” Massachusetts has experienced significant changes in the involvement of key stakeholders over time. As one person from Massachusetts explained, “As of today, our key partners are DYS [Department of Youth Services] Commissioner, Commissioner of Probation, and the Chief Justice of the Juvenile Court. The Triad of Leadership. The three individuals meet about once or twice a year to make sure we’re aligned. Historically, we didn’t begin there.”

The survey asked about the role of juvenile justice leadership at both the state and county level in JDAI scale-up efforts. Table 9 indicates the importance of both state and county juvenile justice leadership. More than 98 percent of respondents indicated that state juvenile justice leadership supports JDAI to a “great extent” or “somewhat,” and more than 93 percent said local leadership supports JDAI to a “great extent” or “somewhat.”

The section on question three explores additional findings around leadership more extensively.

Table 9. To What Extent Does the Juvenile Justice Leadership in Both Your State and County Support the Scale-Up Efforts of JDAI?

	To a Great Extent	Somewhat	Very Little	Not at All	Don't Know	Total Responses
State juvenile justice leadership support of JDAI	74.6% (n=47)	23.8% (n=15)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	1.6% (n=1)	63
Local juvenile justice leadership support of JDAI	53.2% (n=33)	40.3% (n=25)	4.8% (n=3)	0% (n=0)	1.6% (n=1)	62

Question 2: In what ways and to what extent have sites implemented the eight JDAI core strategies to move JDAI to scale?

The interviewees were asked about their experiences implementing JDAI’s eight core strategies, which include expanding alternatives to detention, promoting collaboration, improving conditions of confinement, expediting case processing, utilizing objective admissions assessments, reducing racial and ethnic disparities, reducing special detention cases, and using data to guide decision-making (Casey, 2018). Survey respondents were also asked about their thoughts on how well their state or local jurisdiction was implementing the eight core strategies (see Table 10). Although some strategies were considered more challenging to implement than others, interviewees and survey respondents generally indicated that their states were making progress on each of the strategies.

Table 10. Thinking About the JDAI Eight Core Strategies, How Well Do You Think Your State or Local Jurisdiction Is Currently Implementing Each Strategy?

	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Total Responses
Alternatives to detention programming	29.9% (n=20)	31.3% (n=21)	23.9% (n=16)	10.6% (n=7)	4.5% (n=3)	67
Collaboration	22.4% (n=15)	29.9% (n=20)	32.8% (n=22)	11.9% (n=8)	3.0% (n=2)	67
Conditions of confinement	27.7% (n=18)	32.3% (n=21)	27.7% (n=18)	10.8% (n=7)	1.5% (n=1)	65
Expedited case processing	12.5% (n=8)	28.1% (n=18)	37.5% (n=24)	17.2% (n=11)	4.7% (n=3)	64
Objective admissions decisions	32.8% (n=22)	28.4% (n=19)	25.4% (n=17)	11.9% (n=8)	1.5% (n=1)	67

	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Total Responses
Reducing racial and ethnic disparities	16.8% (n=11)	12.1% (n=8)	37.9% (n=25)	24.2% (n=16)	9.1% (n=6)	66
Special detention cases	12.3% (n=8)	20.0% (n=13)	41.5% (n=27)	21.5% (n=14)	4.6% (n=3)	65
Use of data	31.3% (n=21)	31.3% (n=21)	22.4% (n=15)	14.9% (n=10)	0.0% (n=0)	67

Note: Due to rounding, percentages may not add up to 100%.

Survey participants responded most positively about alternatives to detention programming, objective admissions decisions, conditions of confinement, and use of data (see Table 10). However, findings from the interviews found that collaboration was the strategy that interviewees responded most positively about. Collaboration within the interviewee’s agency and among the agencies implementing JDAI was highlighted as successful. For some states, this collaboration was in place prior to JDAI; in others, it had to be built up. One interviewee encouraged collaboration that is based on trust and can stand changes in administration. In particular, that interviewee recommended developing a set of common goals and a common vision, one that is “sensitive to the political needs of our executive branch partners, but rise[s] above political concerns.” As the interviewee put it, “You need to be wanting the same thing. I think that’s critical. You’ve got to learn to trust your partners. That took time. ... Especially when you’re looking across branches of government.” A majority of survey respondents also considered implementation of collaboration to be “good” (33 percent) or “very good” (30 percent) (see Table 10).

Improving conditions of confinement was considered one of the most successfully implemented strategies among both survey respondents and interviewees. Interviewees mentioned seeing changes in detention centers and the conditions of confinement in their state due to regulations, expectations, and standards set forth by their local or state government. The majority (60 percent) of survey respondents indicated that implementation of this strategy in their jurisdiction has been “excellent” or “very good” (see Table 10).

Objective admissions decisions were considered “excellent” or “very good” among 61 percent of survey respondents (see Table 10). Table 11 summarizes the responses from the survey question asking about risk assessment instruments used when referring youth to a detention facility. Almost 89 percent of respondents indicated that they do use a risk assessment instrument when referring youth to a detention facility. In interviews, this strategy was also highlighted as a success for improving admissions decisions. Interviewees from Massachusetts mentioned creating their own tools for fulfilling this strategy. For example, one said, “We went through a yearlong process to develop a screening tool, called the JPAST [Juvenile Probation Assessment

Screening Tool], used at arraignment, [which] predicts a child likely of failing to appear.”⁷ Interviewees warned that creating a screening tool isn’t enough if judges don’t utilize it.

Table 11. Is a Risk Assessment Instrument Used With Youth When Referred to a Detention Facility?

	Yes	No	Don’t Know	Total Responses
Is a risk assessment instrument used with youth when referred to a detention facility?	88.7% (n=55)	3.2% (n=2)	8.1% (n=5)	62

Most interviewees generally considered using data to be a success, although it was a challenge for some. A few highlighted that using data has become easier with improved systems and more buy-in from those in their agency. In Massachusetts, some interviewees noted that getting data from certain systems can be difficult if the systems are housed outside the agency. Those interviewees who had access to their own data system or one that was utilized statewide found using data to be easier. Most interviewees in Massachusetts and Indiana noted that sharing their data in a meaningful way and making it accessible to all partners was important. One interviewee mentioned that increasing data use has been their “biggest success” and that they “had data before JDAI, but never used it.” The strategy of using data was reported as “excellent” or “very good” in states and local jurisdictions by about 63 percent of survey respondents (see Table 10).

Interviewees noted both successes and challenges with expanding alternatives to detention and reducing the use of detention for what Casey calls “special cases” (e.g., violations of probation or of the conditions of supervision, warrants, and writs). Finding additional alternatives to detention was challenging for some interviewees because doing so takes time and funding. There can also be administrative hurdles when trying to amend legislation. One interviewee mentioned that amending state statutes to allow for shelter care or electronic monitoring was difficult. Other interviewees mentioned that, since detention is handled locally in their state, it’s a challenge to get staff of local detention centers on board. One interviewee even mentioned that some communities consider slightly less detention as an “alternative” to detention. This strategy wasn’t as much of a challenge for survey respondents, the majority of whom (61 percent) described implementation of this strategy as “excellent” or “very good” (see Table 10).

Special detention cases were mentioned as challenging for some interviewees because in some states they are handled in other departments or agencies, such as probation, that are not leading JDAI implementation. Survey respondents also indicated in their responses that this strategy posed a challenge. More than half of respondents (63 percent) indicated that implementation of this strategy was “good” or “fair” in their state or jurisdiction (see Table 10).

Reducing racial and ethnic disparities was also highlighted as a strategy on which states are working hard, but still have a ways to go. Most states and communities are aware of this issue and are focused on it but struggle with finding ways to address it. Several interviewees

⁷ Massachusetts is a juvenile bail state, meaning that young people are entitled to bail, with some exceptions.

mentioned that the entire country is facing this challenge, not just their state or county. Some also mentioned that they need to consider reducing racial and ethnic disparities across the continuum of care — within the health care system, the education system, the justice system, and more. Thirty-three percent of survey respondents considered implementation of this strategy as “fair” or “poor,” the largest percentage at this interval, compared with the other strategies (see Table 10).

The survey went on to ask additional questions about this important and high-priority topic for Casey. The survey question asked what steps the state or local jurisdiction has taken to reduce racial and ethnic disparities in the juvenile justice detention population. Table 12 summarizes the responses, indicating that respondents said they had most often taken the following steps to reduce racial and ethnic disparities: “review and disaggregate data by race and ethnicity” (59 percent), “train staff on implicit bias” (50 percent), and “form a state or local committee to address racial and ethnic disparities” (46 percent).

Table 12. Has Your State or Local Jurisdiction Taken Any of the Following Steps to Reduce Racial and Ethnic Disparities in the Juvenile Justice Detention Population in Your County or State?

	Yes, Completed	In Progress	No	Don't Know	Total Responses
Create formal mandates or memoranda of understanding (MOUs) with key partners	27.7% (n=18)	18.4% (n=12)	27.7% (n=18)	26.2% (n=17)	65
Engage communities of color in detention reform	18.2% (n=12)	45.5% (n=30)	30.3% (n=20)	6.1% (n=4)	66
Focus on addressing the disparity of youth in special detention cases	12.3% (n=8)	60.0% (n=39)	15.4% (n=10)	12.3% (n=8)	65
Form a state or local committee to address racial and ethnic disparities	46.2% (n=30)	24.6% (n=16)	26.2% (n=17)	3.1% (n=2)	65
Review and disaggregate data by race and ethnicity	59.1% (n=39)	36.4% (n=24)	1.5% (n=1)	3.0% (n=2)	66

	Yes, Completed	In Progress	No	Don't Know	Total Responses
Train staff on implicit bias	50.0% (n=33)	39.4% (n=26)	4.6% (n=3)	6.1% (n=4)	66
Other*	4.6% (n=1)	4.6% (n=1)	9.1% (n=2)	81.8% (n=18)	22

*Of the respondents who selected “Other” in response to this question, one person wrote “racial and ethnic disparity training across the state,” and a second person wrote “regular review of data trends associated with race and arrest.” Note: Due to rounding, percentages may not add up to 100%.

Survey respondents were asked an open-ended question about the biggest challenges that they have faced in their efforts to reduce ethnic and racial disparities. More than 50 individuals responded to this question from across the four states. Researchers categorized responses into the following themes (those responses not included were more general statements [n=6] or did not recognize racial and ethnic disparities as a challenge [n=2]):

- In some communities, stakeholders still need to be persuaded that this issue needs to be addressed. Resolving this challenge involves creating buy-in and working across multiple jurisdictions (n=14).
- A diverse and effective mix of people is not always represented in JDAI stakeholder groups. Some survey respondents reported a lack of participation by state or local government agencies or a lack of representation from communities of color involved in this core strategy. Respondents identified the need to focus on equitable practices and ensure that specific agencies make improvements at different points in the system (n=12).
- More follow-ups and consistent training are needed (n=7).
- The complexity of the issue has made it difficult for some communities to address the issue. Respondents reported difficulty having the discussion. Others discussed the wish or intention to broaden the strategy to address other areas of disparity, such as gender, socioeconomic status, sexual orientation, etc. (n=5).
- There can be a lack of data or challenges with data use (n=3).
- Knowing how to have this discussion in communities that do not have much racial diversity can be a challenge (n=2).

Although survey respondents did not highlight expedited case processing as a challenge, several interviewees identified it as an area in which their jurisdictions had struggled to advance reforms. As with other strategies, one challenge with case processing is that it is handled differently across the four states. In one state, it is handled within one department, which is helpful to making changes to this policy. In other states, it is a shared responsibility across multiple departments, which presents challenges. About 22 percent of survey respondents reported their jurisdiction’s implementation of this core strategy as “fair” or “poor” (see Table 10).

Question 3: What are the biggest successes, challenges, and lessons learned from the scale-up process in the four states?

The interviews yielded significant insights into the implementation and scale-up of JDAI programs across the four states. In focusing on the successes and challenges of JDAI programming, four overarching areas emerged from the interviews and survey responses: stakeholder engagement, leadership, data use, and scale-up. Within each of these areas,

interviewees talked about successes in implementation and scale-up and challenges and barriers to success.

Stakeholder Engagement

Interviewees mentioned several successes and challenges relating to the engagement in JDAI of stakeholders — including state and local agency staff and policy makers involved in the implementation and scale-up of JDAI programming. A key theme related to the success of stakeholder engagement was around the importance of collaboration. Challenges related to stakeholder engagement were about resources, inclusion and exclusion of stakeholder involvement in JDAI, and expectations and lack of role clarity of JDAI stakeholders.

Successes

Collaboration. Collaboration is the primary success mentioned throughout the interviews. “Collaboration” refers to the way stakeholders work with one another, and within their institution, to be successful. One interviewee attributed success to the way stakeholders delegate and said, “We use [working groups], which isn’t part of the normal JDAI strategy.” This perspective implies working across organizations and at various levels. Another interviewee highlighted this collaboration across levels by saying, “[We] involved citizen advisory boards across the spectrum.” Another added, “Data people work closely between state and county; they try carefully not to duplicate efforts.” In talking about collaborations with law enforcement, one stakeholder in Indiana mentioned that JDAI has funded and tried to promote use of *Policing the Teen Brain*,⁸ a curriculum that the law enforcement academy is now teaching. One interviewee explained the importance of the training: “Creating that awareness with law enforcement ... [through] *Teaching the Teen Brain*, and now *Parenting the Teen Brain*, ... goes more into prevention [of arrests]. ... [T]hat’s really huge. Our JDAI partners have really helped promote that.” This collaboration among stakeholders facilitates the flow of information and ideas that allows for more efficient communication in the scale-up of JDAI programming.

Challenges

Resources. “Resources” refers to the economic and structural capacity for stakeholders to engage with JDAI programs. Human resources and organizational capacity were the two main resource challenges, as some sites did not have the personnel required for the successful implementation of JDAI. Organizationally, a challenge to JDAI implementation and scale-up is how lack of resources can make stakeholders unprepared to tackle or prioritize juvenile justice reform. For example, one site coordinator described how “economic problems” can make school systems “self-focused” and difficult to engage. Limited resources in communities across the four states have created barriers to fidelity and implementation because too many state and local government agencies lack the economic and structural capacity to implement and scale up JDAI with success.

Inclusion/exclusion. Who is involved, and not involved, was another challenge with regard to stakeholders. Interviewees most often identified law enforcement and schools as institutions that were missing in conversations about JDAI implementation and scale-up. As one interviewee

⁸ The developer of this training is Strategies for Youth, a Massachusetts-based nonprofit. Indianapolis began using *Policing the Teen Brain* in its trainings in 2013 (Bostic, Thurau, Potter, & Drury, 2014).

explained, “Law enforcement and education are missing [because] they have not seen the value of the work at this point.” Other interviewees suggested that law enforcement might not see the value of their work because of a philosophical difference on the best approaches to juvenile justice. These interviewees reported that it was particularly difficult to build law enforcement support for JDAI at the local level. Interviewees described interactions with local police that indicated the police saw JDAI as being too easy on kids or as being a “get out of jail free card.” As one judge reported, “I had a heck of a time with [law enforcement] when I was presiding judge. It was hard to explain to them what JDAI was about; [one law enforcement leader] called it the ‘hug a thug’ program.” These differences in conceptualizing juvenile justice have often made it difficult for JDAI leaders to gain buy-in from law enforcement.

When asked why schools were not involved, respondents agreed that school systems are either limited in resources or do not have the legal authority to incorporate JDAI programming into their system. One respondent stated, “We have the [state] department of elementary and secondary education, but they don’t implement policy on a local level; they don’t have direct control. Working with schools is a challenge.” Each school district having its own governing structure creates a balkanization of educational authority and poses a challenge to the scale-up of JDAI. In some cases, schools may also have approaches to student discipline that run counter to JDAI’s core reform efforts. As one respondent said, “Schools want kids detained — they are calling police.”

The survey also asked about stakeholder involvement and who was represented or missing from the JDAI efforts. Results are summarized in Table 13. Sectors of the community most often said to be represented in JDAI leadership include judges/courts (95 percent), probation officers (89 percent), mental health (80 percent), prosecutors (74 percent), and law enforcement (73 percent). The sectors that respondents said were most likely not to be represented are community members (family, youth) (55 percent), district attorneys (40 percent), substance users (40 percent), and health and human services (30 percent).

Table 13. Thinking of the Leadership of JDAI at Either the State or Local Level, Please Identify What Sectors of the Community Are Represented in the Leadership Team and What sectors of the Community Are Not Represented in the Leadership Team?

	Represented	Not Represented	Don’t Know	Total Responses
Child welfare	70.5% (n=43)	24.6% (n=15)	4.9% (n=3)	61
Community members (family, youth)	40.0% (n=24)	55.0% (n=33)	5.0% (n=3)	60
District attorney	51.7% (n=31)	40.0% (n=24)	8.3% (n=5)	60
Education	65.0% (n=39)	26.7% (n=16)	8.3% (n=5)	60
Health and human services	59.0% (n=36)	29.5% (n=18)	11.5% (n=7)	61

	Represented	Not Represented	Don't Know	Total Responses
Judges/courts	95.1% (n=58)	3.3% (n=2)	1.6% (n=1)	61
Law enforcement	73.3% (n=44)	25.0% (n=15)	1.7% (n=1)	60
Mental health	80.3% (n=49)	16.4% (n=10)	3.3% (n=2)	61
Nonprofit organizations	70.0% (n=42)	23.3% (n=14)	6.7% (n=4)	60
Probation officers	88.5% (n=54)	9.8% (n=6)	1.6% (n=1)	61
Prosecutors	73.8% (n=45)	23.0% (n=14)	3.3% (n=2)	61
Substance use	46.7% (n=28)	40.0% (n=24)	13.3% (n=8)	60
Other*	60.0% (n=9)	6.7% (n=1)	33.3% (n=5)	15

*Other: County council members/commissioners, local government agencies, religious leaders, service organizations, technical/vocational resources, faith-based organizations, public defenders, defense attorneys, public defenders, private industry leaders, detention staff, community corrections staff

Note: Due to rounding, percentages may not add up to 100%.

Expectations. Interviewees mentioned that the uncertainty and the lack of clearly defined expectations and roles for each JDAI stakeholder made implementation and scale-up challenging. In giving an example of this uncertainty, one interviewee said that “one of the bigger problems has been that one agency seems to be putting out all the data for the state. But this does not always help; each agency should bring their own data to make changes.” Expectations about the allocation of resources are another challenge that emerged. One interviewee stated, “Attraction [to join] was the money that came with JDAI. The money required joining JDAI — some [joined] for the money.” Another stakeholder adds, “Most of the sites were not really interested. They thought they would get money, and when they realized it wasn’t about money, they lost interest.” It was a challenge for some state and local leaders to define the expectations and benefits for jurisdictions that adopt JDAI.

Individual and Organizational Leadership

Successes and challenges around the role of leadership in the implementation and scale-up of JDAI programming are grouped into findings related to organizational leadership and individual leadership. “Organizational leadership” refers to the relationships between leadership agencies, whereas “individual leadership” refers to people who have been pivotal in JDAI implementation and scale-up. Some differences in views about the theoretical and conceptual aspects of JDAI were evident, too.

Successes

Organizational leadership. Organizational leadership has been fundamental in the success of JDAI across the four states. One success that emerged across interviews was the role of partner

agencies and organizations in extending collaboration and mentorship across sites and counties. Another success was the role of the judicial branches of government in the leadership and local implementation of JDAI. With regard to collaboration, success was attributed to leadership's willingness to mentor and learn from other stakeholders. One interviewee said, "Existing JDAI counties help new sites come on board and take the first steps. There is a big education piece around JDAI, and the more information that is out there, the more likely the locals are to buy into it." The positive impact of this kind of organizational mentorship was a theme across all sites. One group that was especially lauded for its leadership was the judicial branch. Many respondents expressed that having judges on board who agree with JDAI principles and strategies is fundamental to the success of JDAI. As one explained, "You cannot underestimate the impact of judicial leadership at the state level or at the local level. It can make or break [the initiative]."

Individual leadership. Individual actors have also been pivotal in the scale-up of JDAI. In interviews within each state, one or two individuals emerged who were key players in the scale-up of JDAI. These individuals were passionate about changing the way their states and local jurisdictions approach juvenile justice and were well connected to key state or local government agencies and community groups. These leaders operated mainly in one of two ways: top-down or bottom-up. Leaders who employed a top-down approach were typically connected with political structures at the state or local level and had influence with judges and politicians. Those who took a bottom-up approach were instrumental in the organizing of various community groups to join JDAI leadership. It is these individuals' ability to interact with and persuade key players across multiple levels of power that made them successful. In highlighting the significance of an important leader in JDAI implementation, one interviewee gave the example of a local judge whom "everyone knew. ... [He] had judges' ears and would knock on their door, show them the evidence, and [move] toward implementation." Another stakeholder described a community organizer who was "huge to where JDAI is; their energy and commitment and time put in allowed collaboration to grow [as it] hasn't in the past. Trial court and probation came back to the table." In another state, a similar individual was said to "be [a] very well-respected person in communities," which was important in bringing groups to be more involved.

Challenges

Turnover. Interviewees talked about two challenges regarding leadership: turnover and roles. Respondents reported difficulties in responding to leadership changes over the years. One individual mentioned that "several counties [were] identified to be new sites. But there has been a lot of administration changes over the years, so what might have started in one county could fizzle and then start up in another county." The trade-off is that leadership turnover in some places has represented a kind of reboot. One stakeholder described how one jurisdiction "needed new energy, new vision, to get it going again. That was a lesson, learning how to adapt, how to communicate better — all the things that go with growth."

Turnover in leadership has also been a challenge at the state level, and at least one interviewee pointed to turnover as a test for JDAI's institutionalization in a jurisdiction or a state. As that person explained, "Sustainability requires this transformation of culture in organizations that can withstand the turnover of people." For example, an Indiana respondent reported some difficulties after the state coordinator left JDAI. As one interviewee explained, both the previous and current

state coordinator had valuable skill sets, “but they are two different people,” and key relationships do not always translate immediately from one leader to the next. However, respondents generally praised the transition process and perceived the new JDAI state coordinator to be well-prepared for the task. As one interviewee explained, “There will always be changes in the core leadership group over time, but there need to be people in the wings prepared to take over.” Across the four states, this has not always been the case. For example, New Mexico has struggled with turnover in state and local leadership for many years. When 12 New Mexico JDAI leaders attended a JDAI site visit to New Jersey in September 2017, it was a completely different group than the one that had attended the previous site visit to New Jersey in 2011.

Leadership roles. The leadership role and, at some points, unresponsive or disconnected leadership have added to the challenges of scale-up. One stakeholder expressed the frustration that “everyone has a different boss and none of the organizations answer to each other.” Furthermore, “There are so many demands on local site leads that, if they don’t get support from the Executive Committee, then some things won’t change.” In another case, those on the ground did not all feel that they had equal voices as stakeholders. As one person reported, the solution has been to try to “get line-staff to become more integral parts in these committees.” Frontline professionals have an important role to play in the local implementation of JDAI because “they have the on-ground view and their peer-to-peer might be better to implement because they are seen as legit and knowledgeable about what’s really going on.”

Leadership barriers. Interviewees also described situations in which individuals have acted as barriers to the successful implementation of JDAI. For example, challenges have arisen when individual leaders were not on board with JDAI’s philosophy for reform. Respondents across all four states identified buy-in from judges as an important factor in successful JDAI scale-up. One individual explained that the issue is “not just in JDAI; it’s [generally] hard to get buy-in from judges who don’t want to be told what to do.” In some jurisdictions, there may also be the sentiment that “JDAI takes away authority and power from judges.” As one judge described the issue, “People [are] not understanding the juvenile system ... children are not ‘little adults.’ If a child did something wrong, will you put them in time-out for three years and assume they’ll see what they did wrong?” Lack of knowledge about existing reforms can also represent an obstacle to their effective implementation. For example, one New Mexico stakeholder reported that not all judges know that “JDAI principles are part of [the] Children’s Code,” a reference to a group of state laws that define New Mexico’s responsibilities regarding the care and protection of children and youth, including those in the juvenile justice system. In these ways, individual personalities and resistance to JDAI, particularly by judges, can represent challenges to scale-up.

Data Use

The use of data to inform scale-up and to evaluate processes and outcomes has been an important theme across all four states. In talking about successes with data use, two themes emerged in the study’s interviews: instruments and the utility of data. Two challenges identified regarding data use were quality control and dissemination.

Successes

Admissions screening instruments. The most talked-about success with data use by far is the implementation of a validated admissions risk-screening instrument that was developed by leaders in local juvenile justice systems and validated by researchers. One state's supreme court mandated that all sites use this instrument, which set a standard for juvenile detention and helped in JDAI scale-up. One judge stated, "Having a standard statewide instrument [is important]. Once you say you're going to implement an objective standard, it becomes a lot easier to sell the idea of why some kids are not being locked up." A JDAI site coordinator added that the "biggest success was the implementation of [a] statewide risk assessment tool. [This] helped ensure objectivity and make sure youth were being treated the same way across the state. We were the only state in the nation that had this. [It] was an amazing achievement."

Utility of data. In talking about the importance of using data, one theme that emerged from the interviews was the utility of data. "The data will show you what is being done correctly and what needs to be changed," said one judge. Data allowed for the identification of trends in race/ethnicity, gender, and types of detention. Another judge mentioned, "Having information about gender helped us ID needs for girls. Data allowed me to step back and gain a population-level view." Data helped gain traction with state legislation, as it "showed [legislators] ... that we were able to reduce the number of children who are incarcerated, saving [resources] locally in detention centers and across the Department of Corrections."

Challenges

Quality control. Although the use of data was essential in understanding patterns in juvenile detention, there was a big issue with the quality of data being collected. Another issue is the incompatibility of data within states. As one interviewee put it, there were "challenges around collecting the data, and [we] probably still struggle with that because the systems in [the state] are not connected very well." Agencies across the state collect different data, in different formats, and do not have an efficient way to exchange it. This shortcoming was especially an issue in more rural and remote areas, as "technical capabilities are lower in rural areas, [making it] difficult to figure out how to collect data."

When data were collected, uniformity and fidelity were an issue. One interviewee mentioned that "ensuring uniformity and fidelity is difficult" mainly because the detention assessment instrument was used only by some sites and at different times in the detention process. Another interviewee stated that "even though there's a core strategy for using data, there is no guide. Additionally, the statewide justice information system is not user-friendly. We must keep a different database in addition to state-level data."

Dissemination. The dissemination of data-driven information is another challenge that emerged from the interviews. In some cases, there is a disconnect between the data that are available and the questions that these data are being used to answer. One JDAI stakeholder stated, "It gets to be quite maddening with the requests. Everyone asks for data, but [they] don't know what they want." Another respondent talked about how stakeholders are intimidated by data and not invested because they believe that data are for use by data experts, which creates a lack of a sense of ownership of data. Related to dissemination of data is also the collection and management of data. A respondent suggests that "there needs to be some side-by-side

handholding and working with the counties at a local level to build data systems and management. ... There is a value versus burden trade-off; is the data more valuable than the burden of how to collect it?" Another issue with the dissemination of the data is how different jurisdictions choose to report them. This concern was brought up by one of the judges, who said, "What metric do we use? Why recidivism as [a measure of] success? Why measure a positive with a negative?"

The survey asked respondents to indicate how JDAI stakeholders use data to make decisions about JDAI implementation (Table 14). As in the interview responses, the use of data is an important theme across all survey respondents, with 93 percent saying data are used to make decisions about JDAI implementation. The other uses of data commonly identified by respondents were disaggregating data by race and ethnicity (90 percent), regularly reviewing data with a team or stakeholders (83 percent), and conducting system assessments (80 percent). Also, reinforcing the interview data, the survey identifies dissemination as a challenge. Disseminating data to the public was a method not commonly used, with about 37 percent of respondents stating that they do not implement this practice.

Table 14. Please Indicate How JDAI Stakeholders in Your Community Use Data to Make Decisions About JDAI Implementation.

	Yes	No	Don't Know	Total Responses
Conduct detention utilization studies	78.0% (n=46)	6.8% (n=4)	15.3% (n=9)	59
Conduct system assessments	79.7% (n=47)	8.5% (n=5)	11.7% (n=7)	59
Disaggregate data by race and ethnicity	89.7% (n=52)	1.7% (n=1)	8.6% (n=5)	58
Disseminate data to the public	42.4% (n=25)	37.3% (n=22)	20.3% (n=12)	59
Regularly review updated data with a team or group of stakeholders	83.1% (n=49)	8.5% (n=5)	8.5% (n=5)	59
Use data to make decisions about JDAI implementation	93.2% (n=55)	0.0% (n=0)	6.8% (n=4)	59
Other	0.0% (n=0)	16.7% (n=1)	83.3% (n=5)	6

Note: Due to rounding, percentages may not add up to 100%.

Scale-Up

The scale-up of JDAI has resulted in successes and challenges for states. Interviewees discussed the importance of collaboration and the outcomes that states have attributed to JDAI. Challenges discussed by interviewees related to scale-up were around resources, the relationship between state and local government, and communication.

Successes

Collaboration. Across all four states, when interviewees talked about successful scale-up, they talked about collaboration across agencies and levels. The ability for stakeholders, leadership, and Casey staff to work together has been central to successful scale-up of JDAI. One executive director stated that “one of the reasons we were so successful ... boiled down to relationships, respect, and relationships. Besides being committed to doing the right thing for kids, they all had respect and liked working together.” Collaboration also helped get buy-in from community organizations. Interviewees talked about the importance of getting community members involved in decision-making.

Casey has also been an important collaborator in the scale-up process in multiple states. One person described how “[the foundation] identified strategies. Getting funding was key, and getting a staff structure. They got that done relatively quickly, but they did it with a lot of partners ... and they got significant initial funding in the first year and budget funding again in the second year. That was a key part of scaling up.” Another said, “We have been blessed with a great relationship with the foundation. We asked them to come to a meeting with legislators on two weeks’ notice, and they did. We would in no way be where we are without them.”

The survey asked about which factors have been important to scale-up of JDAI. Like interviewees, survey respondents felt that effective leadership, stakeholder buy-in, Casey support, and collaboration have been important for statewide scale-up of JDAI (Table 15). Respondents said that the following entities have been “very important” or “important” in their states:

- Judicial leadership (92%)
- Leadership team (92%)
- Executive branch leadership (74%)
- Legislative branch leadership (65%)

The majority of survey respondents identified buy-in from local stakeholders as “very important” or “important” (86 percent) to JDAI scale-up. The majority of survey respondents also identified buy-in from state stakeholders as “very important” or “important” (88 percent). Similarly, collaboration among statewide agencies and stakeholders was rated as “very important” or “important” by about 86 percent of respondents, and the presence of champions of JDAI were each rated as “very important” or “important” by about 88 percent of respondents. A combined 94 percent of survey respondents rated access to quality data as either “important” or “very important.” Lastly, survey respondents identified Casey’s support as an “important” or “very important” factor (86 percent) in JDAI scale-up (see Table 15).

Table 15. In Your Opinion, How Important Have the Following Factors Been in the Scale-Up of JDAI in Your State Up to This Point in Time?

	Very Important	Important	Moderately Important	Slightly Important	Not Important	Total Responses
Access to quality data	69.2% (n=45)	24.6% (n=16)	4.6% (n=3)	1.5% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	65

	Very Important	Important	Moderately Important	Slightly Important	Not Important	Total Responses
Advocates	36.5% (n=23)	47.6% (n=30)	14.3% (n=9)	1.6% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	63
Champions of JDAI (local and statewide)	58.5% (n=38)	29.2% (n=19)	10.8% (n=7)	1.5% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	65
Collaboration among statewide agencies and stakeholders	63.1% (n=41)	23.0% (n=15)	10.8% (n=7)	3.1% (n=2)	0% (n=0)	65
Community engagement	46.2% (n=30)	36.9% (n=24)	12.3% (n=8)	3.1% (n=2)	1.5% (n=1)	65
Executive branch leadership	33.9% (n=22)	40.0% (n=26)	18.5% (n=12)	6.2% (n=4)	1.5% (n=1)	65
Judicial branch leadership	60.0% (n=39)	32.3% (n=21)	7.7% (n=5)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	65
Leadership team	52.3% (n=34)	40.0% (n=26)	6.2% (n=4)	1.5% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	65
Legislative branch leadership	30.2% (n=19)	34.9% (n=22)	20.6% (n=13)	12.7% (8)	1.6% (n=1)	63
Local stakeholder buy-in	58.5% (n=38)	27.7% (n=18)	9.2% (n=6)	3.1% (n=2)	1.5% (n=1)	65
State stakeholder buy-in	56.9% (n=37)	30.8% (n=20)	10.8% (n=7)	1.5% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	65
Support from the Casey Foundation	56.9% (n=37)	29.2% (n=19)	7.7% (n=5)	6.2% (n=4)	0% (n=0)	65
Other*	0% (n=0)	10.0% (n=1)	0% (n=0)	0% (n=0)	90.0% (n=9)	10

*Examples of “Other” responses: 1. "Family voice has been a priority." 2. "...I have yet to see [legislative and executive branch leadership]. It would definitely help!"

Note: Due to rounding, percentages may not add up to 100%.

Outcomes. In talking about what has been successful in the scale-up of JDAI, interviewees often cited statistics on outcomes and argued that the best measure of success is the outcome for youth. Respondents in all four states said that a measure of success is the reduction of the number of youth in detention. The narrowing of the gap in the incarceration rates of youth of color was also talked about as a goal that states are currently working to achieve. Respondents from all states said that they are starting to see progress but noted that there is still work to do. One coordinator said, “We took a look at [our standard] probation agreement, looking at reasons for detention while looking at the data. Whatever process we had in place was affecting people of color three

to four times the rate of White kids.” This information enabled them to address the issue and gave them a new framework as they scaled up across the state. This new framework has influenced how sites approach the issue of racial disparities and has allowed for newer sites to begin the conversation in the early phases of scale-up. As one interviewee from another site stated, “Race and bias are something people won’t talk about, and we are getting that conversation started. It’s hard to move the dial; I think we’ve started the conversation.”

Challenges

Resources. Resources refer to the human, social, and material capital that is needed for the successful scale-up of JDAI. Many interviewees talked about a lack of resources being a major challenge to scale-up, including administration changes and human resources. Turnover was a prominent challenge that set back sites as they replaced and trained the newcomers. One site administrator, in talking about the help the site has received from stakeholders, stated that stakeholders “helped us know where we want to put our focus ... and what counties we think might be good to advance JDAI. But then there is the turnover issue, which makes it hard to sustain a movement.” Turnover ranged from line-workers to administrative personnel. Another challenge was human resources and the need for more support. Interviewees working on the local level talked about the limited time and bandwidth they have alongside the amount of work they are expected to accomplish. One interviewee highlighted this issue: “Unfortunately, we are a big wide-open state, our area is wide, and our population is not large. But we’re a poor state ... with lots of remote locations.” Another stated that it was “hard to do eight-point strategies at each site because not all sites had the resources.”

Relationship between state and local government. A second challenge to scale-up that emerged across all four states was the interaction across the various levels of government (e.g., state versus county). The most-mentioned issue was the relationship between state and local leadership and stakeholders. In talking about the connection between statewide work and local work, one interviewee said, “If you have people coming on with ideas, there is a lot of work to be done to have [leadership] say yes. We have strong local power, [but it’s] not grasped at state level. Not sure they understand the momentum we have built and what we can do. [There’s] still a disconnect between state and local.” Interviewees talked about the challenge of aligning state and local progress. One interviewee described how “the state strategists ... have to walk that line of challenging the sites without alienating the sites. Sometimes the data is showing something, but sites are not ready to act on it. There’s an art to how the [strategists] work with the counties to help them take action.” The role of a local JDAI coordinator was discussed as helping with the process of engaging and coordinating JDAI efforts at the local level, although this position is relatively new in some states, like Massachusetts.

Communication. The third challenge to scale-up has been communication, especially regarding understanding the principles of JDAI across stakeholders. In explaining this challenge, one respondent stated that there needs to be a “reeducation on JDAI. [It’s] a new way of thinking about the legal aspects of juvenile [justice], new ways for the court, new ways of using data. [It is a] view of detention as harmful.” However, this message has been difficult to accept by some stakeholders. One respondent stated that “judges, they have discretion, and some judges are resistant and don’t believe [in the new way of thinking about juvenile detention].”

Interviewee and Survey Respondents' Recommendations

As part of the interviews and surveys, respondents from the four study states offered recommendations for other states that are considering or planning statewide scale-up of JDAI. Although their recommendations touched on a range of topics, a few primary themes emerged from the data. The following summaries of recommendations relate to leadership, collaboration, messaging, data use, stakeholder engagement, and the pace of scale-up.

1. **Leadership:** Involve judiciary leadership early in the JDAI scale-up effort. Judicial leadership is particularly effective in advancing JDAI's goals and building buy-in at the state and local levels.

Unsurprisingly, interviewees and survey respondents reported that JDAI reforms are typically spearheaded by those stakeholders who interact most regularly with the juvenile courts and the juvenile detention system. Many interviewees argued that the development of judicial leadership is particularly effective in advancing JDAI's goals. Even in states such as Indiana, where state courts do not directly control the practices of county-level judges and magistrates, state-level judges may be in a unique position to win over law enforcement stakeholders and advocate for change. In addition, the active buy-in and engagement of this kind of high-level judicial leadership can lend cover and credibility to state and local JDAI coordinators in their efforts to challenge the status quo. As one Indiana interviewee said, "I can't stress enough how successful it was having the state supreme court be the lead [for JDAI]. ... Having that influence on a statewide basis really made the [scale-up] process easier." At the same time, not all interviewees believed that state-level JDAI leadership must rest with the judiciary. As one interviewee recommended, "Even if not the supreme court or judicial leadership, have a champion who is respected and listened to."

2. **Collaboration:** Include strategies that foster collaboration among stakeholders in the scale-up effort. Collaboration and shared decision-making are important for JDAI scale-up. Be sure to facilitate collaboration between the justice system and other branches of government to support JDAI.

Interviewees in each state also stressed the importance of collaboration at the leadership level. "Leadership should be shared so there's no feeling of stuff being shoved down someone's throat," explained one interviewee. "We must come together and share the decisions." Several interviewees specifically discussed the importance of facilitating collaboration between the justice system and other branches of government to support JDAI. For example, state funding for JDAI is possible only in states in which both the governor and the legislature have supported the initiative and recognized it as a priority. Interviewees argued that JDAI "shouldn't be seen as a pocket program" but instead as a complex initiative with cross-sector and far-reaching implications that affect a wide range of constituencies. As one interviewee explained, "We need to see the bigger picture and see how this affects us all."

3. **Messaging:** To build broad buy-in and engage different stakeholder groups, use clear messaging and communications about what JDAI is and how it improves outcomes for youth.

Several interviewees in the four states recommended dedicating resources to a strategy of thoughtful messaging and ongoing stakeholder education about JDAI. As one interviewee explained, it is “important to ensure the political branches of government know [JDAI] leads to better results and outcomes for kids.” More broadly, respondents described how their states’ communications around JDAI have affected buy-in among all stakeholder groups. For example, some interviewees argued that messaging should be accessible, with one state-level stakeholder cautioning, “Our messaging sometimes gets lost when we become too technical with our words.” Other respondents were more concerned with how to persuade reluctant stakeholders and build buy-in for the JDAI model. These interviewees recommended relying on data, focusing on the importance of local decision-making, and carefully selecting messengers or “champions” to sway people who are initially skeptical of JDAI.

4. **Data use:** To facilitate access to quality data for decision-making and outcome-tracking, incorporate plans for data collection, management, and use at the beginning of any scale-up efforts .

Because of the importance of data to both decision-making and communications in the JDAI model, interviewees across the four states recommended that states incorporate plans for data collection, management, and use at the beginning of any scale-up efforts. One interviewee summarized this perspective: “[You’ve] got to start from square one to make sure the correct data are collected and collected appropriately.” For states that want to bring JDAI to scale, the first step may be “to do an assessment . . . to see how data is being used, how ready they are, to know what they are up against.” Other interviewees emphasized the importance of establishing “good data-sharing agreements” or identifying and training people who will analyze the data for stakeholders to use. As more than one interviewee noted, JDAI is “a data-driven initiative,” and establishing good data practices from the beginning can facilitate long-term growth in states where scale-up is a goal.

5. **Stakeholder engagement:** Develop a strong state-level collaborative that, although it likely includes judicial leadership, is inclusive of a diverse group — from key government stakeholders to local community members, youth, and families — that participates actively in both decision-making and ongoing messaging efforts.

Overall, interviewees recommended that other states planning to scale-up JDAI focus on developing a strong state-level collaborative that has strong judicial leadership and includes a diverse group of stakeholders who participate actively in both decision-making and ongoing messaging efforts. These interviewees conveyed a vision for a state-level collaborative that is made up of a combination of state and local leaders, including counties that were early adopters of JDAI; representatives from the judicial, executive, and legislative branches; and stakeholders from other social and human service systems (such as schools, state and local departments of education, health systems, and behavioral health agencies) that serve at-risk youth and their

families. A few interviewees, primarily at the local level, also strongly recommended intentional engagement of community members — youth and their families — in the JDAI scale-up process. As one interviewee reported, “If you don’t have community at the table, you’re just going to spin your wheels.”

6. **Pace of scale-up:** Match the rate of growth and scale-up to a state’s capacity to build infrastructure supports for JDAI to endure growth, engagement, and sustainability.

Interviewees acknowledged that developing this kind of collaborative leadership and broad-based buy-in takes time. Although interviewees in New Mexico have struggled with the slow pace of statewide JDAI implementation, in Indiana, where JDAI scale-up has moved very quickly, interviewees emphasized that there are advantages to a more gradual process of growth. For example, some interviewees in Indiana recommended that states match their rate of growth to their ability to build infrastructural supports. As one Indiana interviewee explained, “The trade-off in moving quickly at first was that there wasn’t sufficient manpower in the local communities to make sure there was fidelity to the model.” Only by taking the time to gather all of these stakeholder groups together can states “break ... down silos” and bring about meaningful and sustained juvenile justice reforms.

V. Conclusion

This study set out to document the experiences that state and local stakeholders from Indiana, Massachusetts, Missouri, and New Mexico have had while scaling up JDAI. Overall, the four states applied most of the building blocks prescribed by JDAI; however, how those principles transfer to practice is unique to each site and local context. Interviewees and survey respondents in all four states reported positive outcomes from JDAI on many levels, from declines in the use of juvenile detention to new collaborations and shifts in attitude that have the potential for wider effects on juvenile justice policies and practices. However, scaling the initiative has also presented challenges at both the state and local levels. Together, the stakeholders in these four states offer a set of lessons derived from both their setbacks and their successes during the scale-up process that can be considered and applied in other states seeking to bring JDAI to scale.

References

The Annie E. Casey Foundation. (1999a). *Consider the alternatives: Planning and implementing detention alternatives*. Baltimore, MD: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.aecf.org/resources/consider-the-alternatives/>

The Annie E. Casey Foundation. (2014a). *JDAI in New Jersey: A statewide replication success story – and lessons for taking JDAI statewide*. Baltimore, MD: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.aecf.org/resources/jdai-in-new-jersey/>

The Annie E. Casey Foundation. (1999b). *The JDAI story: Building a better juvenile detention system*. Baltimore, MD: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.aecf.org/resources/overview-the-jdai-story/>

The Annie E. Casey Foundation. (2017a). *JDAI at 25: Insights from the Annual Results Report*. Retrieved from <http://www.aecf.org/m/resourcedoc/aecf-jdaiat25-2017.pdf>

The Annie E. Casey Foundation. (2018). *Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative* [Webpage]. Retrieved from <http://www.aecf.org/work/juvenile-justice/jdai/>

The Annie E. Casey Foundation. (2016). *New funds limit use of detention facilities for Massachusetts youth and expand JDAI* [Blog post]. Retrieved from <http://www.aecf.org/blog/new-funds-limit-use-of-detention-facilities-for-massachusetts-youth-and-expand-jdai-1/>

The Annie E. Casey Foundation. (1999c). *Planning for juvenile detention reforms: A structured approach*. Baltimore, MD: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.aecf.org/resources/planning-for-juvenile-detention-reforms/>

The Annie E. Casey Foundation. (2017b). *Reducing youth incarceration* [Blog post]. Retrieved from <http://www.aecf.org/work/juvenile-justice/reducing-youth-incarceration/>

The Annie E. Casey Foundation. (2001). *Replicating detention reform: Lessons from the Florida Detention Initiative*. Baltimore, MD: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.aecf.org/resources/replicating-detention-reform/>

The Annie E. Casey Foundation. (2014b). *Turning JDAI's focus to the deep end of the juvenile justice system* [Blog post]. Retrieved from <http://www.aecf.org/blog/turning-jdais-focus-to-the-deep-end-of-the-juvenile-justice-system/>

The Annie E. Casey Foundation. (2009). *Two decades of JDAI: From demonstration project to national standard*. Baltimore, MD: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.aecf.org/resources/two-decades-of-jdai/>

Bernstein, J. (2014). *Unlocking potential: Examining the funding of juvenile detention and effective alternatives in Massachusetts*. Boston, MA: Massachusetts Budget and Policy Center.

Retrieved from http://www.massbudget.org/report_window.php?loc=2014-Unlocking_potential.html

Bostic, J. Q., Thureau, L., Potter, M., & Drury, S. S. (2014). Policing the teen brain. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 53(2), 127–129.

Campie, P. E., & Sokolsky, J. (2016). *Systematic review of factors that impact implementation quality of child welfare, public health, and education programs for adolescents: Implications for juvenile drug treatment courts* (NCJ 250483). Office of Justice Programs. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/ojdp/grants/250483.pdf>

Chief Justice Earl Warren Institute on Law and Social Policy. (2012). *An evaluation of the Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative: JDAI sites and states compared to home state totals*. Berkeley, CA: University of California, Berkeley School of Law. Retrieved from <https://www.law.berkeley.edu/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/JDAI-Rep-1-FINAL.pdf>

Coburn, C. E. (2003). Rethinking scale: Moving beyond numbers to deep and lasting change. *Educational Researcher*, 32(6), 3–12.

Damschroder, L. J., Aron, D. C., Keith, R. E., Kirsch, S. R., Alexander, J. A., & Lowery, J. C. (2009). Fostering implementation of health services research findings into practice: A consolidated framework for advancing implementation science. *Implementation Science*, 4(1), 50–65.

Edwards, N., & Barker, P. M. (2014). The importance of context in implementation research. *Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes*, 67, S157–S162.

Executive Office of Health and Human Services. (2017). *The history of JDAI in Massachusetts*. Retrieved from <http://www.mass.gov/eohhs/gov/commissions-and-initiatives/jdai/the-history-of-jdai-in-massachusetts.html>

Fixsen, D., Blase, K., Metz, A., & Van Dyke, M. (2013). Statewide implementation of evidence-based programs. *Council for Exceptional Children*, 79(2), 213–230.

Florida Department of Juvenile Justice. (2017). *Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative*. Retrieved from [http://www.djj.state.fl.us/research/latest-initiatives/juvenile-detention-alternatives-initiative-\(jdai\)](http://www.djj.state.fl.us/research/latest-initiatives/juvenile-detention-alternatives-initiative-(jdai))

Greenhalgh, T., Robert, G., MacFarlane, F., Bate, P., & Kyriakidou, O. (2004). Diffusion of innovations in service organizations: Systematic review and recommendations. *The Milbank Quarterly* 82(4), 581–629.

National Research Council. (2013). *Reforming juvenile justice: A developmental approach*. Committee on Assessing Juvenile Justice Reform. (R. J. Bonnie, R. L. Johnson, B. M. Chemers, & J. A. Schuck, Eds.). Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. Retrieved from <https://www.nap.edu/catalog/14685/reforming-juvenile-justice-a-developmental-approach>

Nissen, L. B., & Merrigan, D. (2011). The development and evolution of Reclaiming Futures at the ten-year mark: Reflections and recommendations. *Children and Youth Services Review, 33*, S9–S15.

Rush, L. H., Rucker, R. D., David, S. H., Massa, M. S., & Slaughter, G. G. (2016). *Annual report 2015–2016*. Indianapolis, IN: Indiana Supreme Court, Office of Communication, Education, & Outreach.

Stevens, B., Sattar, S., Morzuch, M., Young, D., Ruttner, L., Stein, J., Hargreaves, M., & Foster, L. (2016). *Final report from the Models for Change evaluation*. Oakland, CA: Mathematica Policy Research.

Supplee, L. H., & Metz, A. M. (2015). Opportunities and challenges in evidence-based social policy. *Sharing Child and Youth Development Knowledge, 28*(4), 1–16.

Swisstack, T. E., Mitchell, D. E., & Leyba, C. (2011). *Smaller, smarter and more strategic: Juvenile justice reform in Bernalillo County*. Bernalillo County, NM: Bernalillo County Youth Services Center.

Appendix A: Interview Protocols

Casey Foundation JDAI Interview Protocol

Introductions

1. Introductions and description of study
2. Please describe your role [with the Juvenile Justice Strategy Group/JDAI/*Foundation OR if retired, your role with JDAI*]? How long have you been in the role? What was your role before you started this position?

Evolution of the Initiative

3. Specific to JDAI state scale, what do you see as significant changes in JDAI over the years? Can you describe the implementation of JDAI in the states that took on this work (probe on Indiana, Massachusetts, Missouri, and New Mexico)? How has that changed in the new states that have implemented JDAI?
4. Do you think JDAI and its eight core strategies are still evolving? How?
5. Can you describe how the eight core strategies were developed for JDAI? To what extent are sites effectively carrying out these strategies (probe on Indiana, Massachusetts, Missouri, and New Mexico)? What are the challenges to achieving the strategies? Assets?
6. What do you envision for JDAI over the next five years related to state scale-up and replication?

JDAI State Scale-Up and Implementation

7. Describe the JDAI scale-up process (probe on specifics for Indiana, Massachusetts, Missouri, and New Mexico).
 - a. Ideal scale-up process
 - b. Training, ongoing support, measuring outcomes
 - c. *Either* the site progress with specific strategies (data, collaboration, conditions, and disparities) *or* the strategies that the site made the most progress with and the least and why
8. Describe how each state has made progress on the eight core strategies (probe on specifics for Indiana, Massachusetts, Missouri, and New Mexico). How has it impacted implementation generally? How has it impacted state scale-up?
 - a. Collaboration
 - b. Use of data
 - c. Objective admissions decisions
 - d. Alternatives to detention programming
 - e. Expedited case processing
 - f. Special detention cases
 - g. Conditions of confinement
 - h. Reducing racial and ethnic disparities
9. Can you describe the capacity (such as those around staffing, technical expertise, funding, etc.) of the states to implement JDAI? Did capacity differ between the state and local level? How has that impacted implementation?

10. To what extent is JDAI implemented consistently across states to ensure fidelity to the model (probe on Indiana, Massachusetts, Missouri, and New Mexico)?
 - a. Are states required to report implementation data? How do you know if data is missing?
 - b. Are staff following standard protocols for implementation?
 - c. How do you monitor this?
11. What do you see as the biggest challenges with the scale-up of JDAI (probe on specifics for Indiana, Massachusetts, Missouri, and New Mexico)?
12. What are the key successes with the scale-up of JDAI (probe on specifics for Indiana, Massachusetts, Missouri, and New Mexico)?
 - a. What factors contribute to these successes?

Data Use

13. How do the states use data to monitor implementation and make decisions on JDAI? How do these states compare with other states implementing JDAI?
14. What are some of the biggest challenges with data collection and data use at the state and local level?

Evaluation

15. How do you define success for a state working to scale JDAI across local jurisdictions (probe on specifics for Indiana, Massachusetts, Missouri, and New Mexico)?
16. How do you measure success for a state working to scale JDAI across local jurisdictions (probe on specifics for Indiana, Massachusetts, Missouri, and New Mexico)?

Conclusion

17. What do you hope to learn from this study?
18. Is there anything else you would like to mention about JDAI?

JDAI State Coordinator Interview Protocol

Introductions

1. Introductions and reminder about study purpose and confidentiality
2. Please describe your role with JDAI. How long have you been in the role? What was your role before you started this position?
3. Can you briefly describe how the juvenile justice system is structured in your state (what does the state oversee vs. local counties or jurisdictions) and how JDAI operates at the state level within that structure? *[NOTE: We will have some of this information from our preliminary work, start with what we know and ask for clarification for each state.]*
4. Can you briefly describe JDAI? What are the main goals of the initiative?
5. Can you briefly describe the history of JDAI scale-up in your state (probe: do you have a timeline or document that we could review; when did the state become involved in JDAI)?

Evolution of Initiative

6. What agencies have been key to JDAI in your state and local jurisdictions? Have any key agencies or stakeholders ever been missing or not fully supportive of JDAI implementation?
7. What do you see as significant changes in JDAI over the years in your state? How has implementation changed over time in your state?
8. What do you envision for JDAI implementation over the next five years in your state? What result is your state aiming to achieve?

JDAI State Scale-Up and Implementation

9. Describe the JDAI scale-up process in your state.
 - a. Decision-making process (e.g., who decided that scale-up should happen), training, ongoing support, measuring outcomes, funding levels
 - b. How did the state approach and organize for replication and scale?
10. Can you describe how your state has used the eight core strategies for JDAI? Are those strategies being achieved in your state? What are the challenges and assets to achieving the strategies?
 - a. Collaboration
 - b. Use of data
 - c. Objective admissions decisions
 - d. Alternatives to detention programming
 - e. Expedited case processing
 - f. Special detention cases
 - g. Conditions of confinement
 - h. Reducing racial and ethnic disparities
11. Can you describe the leadership of JDAI at both the state and local level? How has that impacted the implementation of JDAI in general? How has it impacted the scale-up of JDAI? Have any key leaders ever not supported JDAI? Did that impact implementation and, if so, how?
12. How would you describe your state's capacity (such as those around staffing, technical expertise, funding, etc.) to implement JDAI? Did capacity differ between the state and local level? How has that impacted implementation?

13. What do you see as the biggest challenges with the scale-up of JDAI in your state? (Probe: If you were to do it over, what would you change?)
14. What are the successes with the reforms implemented and processes developed for scale-up of JDAI in your state?
 - a. What factors have contributed to these successes?
15. How do you measure implementation of JDAI in your state (tools, data collection, measures)? How is this information used?

Data Use

16. What data do you track related to JDAI in your state?
17. How have you used data at the state level to help with JDAI scale-up?
18. How do you use data to monitor implementation and make decisions?

Evaluation and Results

19. How do you define success for JDAI in your state?
20. How do you measure success for JDAI in your state? What key results are evident to date?

The Annie E. Casey Foundation/Technical Assistance

21. How do you work with the foundation on JDAI? Has this changed over time? If so, how?
22. Describe the foundation-supported technical assistance your state has received. What has been the most helpful? What additional support would have been helpful?
23. Did your state access any other technical support for JDAI implementation and scale-up outside foundation-funded support? If so, please describe.

Conclusion

24. What would you recommend to another state looking to scale-up JDAI or a similar reform initiative? What were the key elements that are necessary to scale up such an initiative?
25. Are there other juvenile justice reform initiatives in your state that have not been sustained or continued with less success? Why and what makes JDAI different from those?
26. Is there anything else you would like to mention about JDAI?

State and Local Stakeholder Interview Protocol

Introductions

1. Introductions and description of study purpose and confidentiality (review pre-interview information sheet)
2. Please describe your role in JDAI. How long have you been in the role?

JDAI State Scale-Up and Implementation

3. Describe the JDAI scale-up process in your state. *If local: Frame for a more local perspective.*
4. What do you see as the biggest challenges with the scale-up of JDAI in your state? (Probe: If you were to do it over, what would you change?) *If local: Frame for a more local perspective.*
5. What have been the largest successes your state has experienced in the process of JDAI scale-up? What factors have contributed to these successes?
6. Thinking about the eight core strategies that have been implemented in your state, what strategies have been easier to implement/more successful? What strategies have been more difficult/less successful?
 - a. Collaboration
 - b. Use of data
 - c. Objective admissions decisions
 - d. Alternatives to detention programming
 - e. Expedited case processing
 - f. Special detention cases
 - g. Conditions of confinement
 - h. Reducing racial and ethnic disparities
7. How has implementation changed over time in your state?
 - a. Probe on each: state and local leadership changes, governance structure of JDAI, champions of the initiative, policy changes, approach to JDAI, other.

Leadership

8. Can you describe the leadership of JDAI at both the state and local level? How has it impacted the scale-up of JDAI? *If local: Be sure to ask about local leadership first.*
9. What agencies have been key to JDAI in your state and local jurisdictions? Have any key agencies or stakeholders ever been missing or not fully supportive of JDAI implementation?

Data Use

10. How do you use data to monitor implementation and make decisions on JDAI?
11. What are some of the biggest challenges with data collection and data use at the state and local levels?

Evaluation and Results

12. How do you define success for JDAI in your state?

13. How do you measure success for JDAI in your state? What key results are evident to date?

The Annie E. Casey Foundation/Technical Assistance

14. Have you visited New Jersey? If so, how did the visit influence JDAI in your site?

15. How do you work with the foundation on JDAI? Has this changed over time? And, if so, how?

Conclusion

16. What do you envision for JDAI implementation over the next five years in your state?

What result is your state aiming to achieve?

17. What would you recommend to another state looking to scale up JDAI or a similar reform initiative?

18. Is there anything else you would like to mention about JDAI?

New Jersey Model Site JDAI Interview Protocol

Introductions

1. Introductions and description of study purpose and confidentiality
2. Please describe your role in the New Jersey JDAI. How long have you been in the role? What was your role before you started this position?
3. When did the state become involved in JDAI? Can you briefly describe how the juvenile justice system structure in New Jersey influences how JDAI operates at the state?
4. What does it mean for New Jersey to be a model site for JDAI?

Evolution of the Initiative

5. What agencies have been key to JDAI in your state and local jurisdictions? Have any key agencies or stakeholders ever been missing or not fully supportive of JDAI implementation?
6. What do you see as significant changes in JDAI over the years in New Jersey? How has implementation changed over time in your state?
7. What do you envision for JDAI implementation over the next five years in your state? What result is your state aiming to achieve?

JDAI State Scale-Up and Implementation

8. Describe the JDAI scale-up process for New Jersey.
 - a. Decision-making process (e.g., who decided that scale-up should happen), training, ongoing support, measuring outcomes, funding levels
 - b. How did the state approach and organize for replication and scale?
9. Can you describe how the eight core strategies were implemented in New Jersey? What are the challenges to achieving the strategies?
 - a. Collaboration
 - b. Use of data
 - c. Objective admissions decisions
 - d. Alternatives to detention programming
 - e. Expedited case processing
 - f. Special detention cases
 - g. Conditions of confinement
 - h. Reducing racial and ethnic disparities
10. Can you describe the leadership of JDAI at both the state and local levels? How has that impacted the implementation of JDAI in general? How has it impacted the scale-up of JDAI? Have any key leaders ever not supported JDAI? Did that impact implementation, and if so, how?
11. How would you describe your state's capacity (such as those around staffing, technical expertise, funding, etc.) to implement JDAI? Did capacity differ between the state and local level? How has that impacted implementation?
12. What do you see as the biggest challenges with the scale-up of JDAI in your state? (Probe: If you were to do it over, what would you change?)
13. What are the successes with the reforms implemented and processes developed for scale-up of JDAI in your state?
 - a. What factors have contributed to these successes?

14. How do you measure implementation of JDAI in your state (tools, data collection, measures)? How is this information used?
15. What do you recommend to other states taking this on?

Data Use

16. Do you track implementation data? If so, what data do you use? What's the quality of these data?
17. How do you use data to monitor implementation and make decisions on JDAI?
18. What are some of the biggest challenges with data collection and data use at the state and local level?

Evaluation and Results

19. How do you define success for JDAI in your state?
20. How do you measure success for JDAI in your state? What key results are evident to date?

The Annie E. Casey Foundation/Technical Assistance

21. How do you work with the Foundation on JDAI? Has this changed over time? And, if so, how?
22. Describe the Foundation-supported technical assistance your state has received. What has been the most helpful? What additional support would have been helpful?
23. Did your state access any other technical support for JDAI implementation and scale-up outside of Foundation-funded support? If so, please describe.

Conclusion

24. What would you recommend to another state looking to scale up JDAI or a similar reform initiative? What were the key elements that are necessary to scale up such an initiative?
25. Are there other juvenile justice reform initiatives in your state that have not been sustained or continued with less success? Why and what makes JDAI different from those?
26. Is there anything else you would like to mention about JDAI?

Appendix B: Survey

State Selection

1. Please select which state you're from.

- Indiana
- Massachusetts
- Missouri
- New Mexico

Background

For this survey, we would like to gather perspectives from both state and local JDAI stakeholders. In question 1 below, please identify the perspective that best describes your current role with JDAI. As you continue to answer the survey questions, please answer from the perspective you choose in question 1.

2. Do you describe yourself as a local or a statewide JDAI stakeholder? *Examples of local stakeholders include county government, local agency personnel, local JDAI coordinators, etc. Examples of statewide JDAI stakeholders include state staff, state steering committee members, etc.*

- Statewide stakeholder
- Local (e.g., county) stakeholder

3. What is your current role?

- Child welfare
- District Attorney
- Education
- Health and Human Services
- Juvenile Justice Personnel
- Law Enforcement
- Local Government
- Local Juvenile Judge
- Mental Health
- Non-Profit / Community Based Organization
- Probation Officer

- Prosecutor
- State Government
- Supreme Court Judge
- Other (please specify): _____

4. How long have you been in this role?

- Less than one year
- More than 1 year to 2 years
- More than 2 years to 4 years
- More than 4 years to 6 years
- More than 6 years

5. How long have you been working on JDAI?

- Less than one year
- More than 1 year to 2 years
- More than 2 years to 4 years
- More than 4 years to 6 years
- More than 6 years

JDAI State Scale-Up and Implementation

6. Have you been or are you currently a member in a subcommittee that is addressing any of the JDAI core strategies? If you have been a member formerly and are also a current member, please check both columns.

	Yes, formerly	Yes, currently	No
Alternatives to Detention Programing			
Collaboration			
Conditions of Confinement			
Expedited case processing			
Objective Admissions Decisions			
Reducing Racial & Ethnic Disparities			
Special Detention Cases			
Use of Data			

7. Thinking about the JDAI eight cores strategies, how well do you think your state or local jurisdiction is currently implementing each strategy?

	Excellent	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor
Alternatives to Detention Programing					
Collaboration					
Conditions of Confinement					
Expedited case processing					
Objective Admissions Decisions					
Reducing Racial & Ethnic Disparities					
Special Detention Cases					
Use of Data					

8. Has your state or local jurisdiction taken any of the following steps to reduce racial and ethnic disparities in the juvenile justice detention population in your county or state?

	Yes	In Progress	No	Don't Know
Create formal mandates or MOUs with key partners				
Engage communities of color in detention reform				
Focus on addressing the disparity of youth in special detention cases				
Form a state or local committee to address racial and ethnic disparities				
Review and disaggregate data by race and ethnicity				
Train staff on implicit bias				
Other (please specify):				

9. What do you think is the biggest challenge in reducing racial and ethnic disparities in your state or local jurisdiction? (open ended)

10. In your opinion, how important have the following factors been in the scale up of JDAI in your state up to this point in time?

	Very Important	Important	Moderately Important	Slightly Important	Not Important
Access to quality data					
Advocates					
Champions of JDAI (local and statewide)					
Collaboration among statewide agencies and stakeholders					
Community engagement					
Executive branch leadership					
Judicial branch leadership					
Leadership team					
Legislative branch leadership					
Local stakeholder buy-in					
State stakeholder buy-in					
Support from the Casey Foundation					
Other (please specify):					

11. In your opinion, how important are the following factors in the scale up of JDAI in your state from this point moving forward?

	Very Important	Important	Moderately Important	Slightly Important	Not Important
Access to quality data					
Advocates					
Champions of JDAI (local and statewide)					
Collaboration among statewide agencies and stakeholders					
Community engagement					
Executive branch leadership					
Judicial branch leadership					
Leadership team					
Legislative branch leadership					
Local stakeholder buy-in					

State stakeholder buy-in					
Support from the Casey Foundation					
Other:					

12. Please describe the largest challenge to the scale up of JDAI in your state. (open ended)

13. Please describe the most significant success of JDAI in your state. (open ended)

Leadership and Engagement

The following questions are about the leadership and stakeholders involved in JDAI. If you identified as a state stakeholder, please think of the state level leadership teams or committees, if you identified as a local stakeholder please think of the local leadership teams or committees.

14. To what extent does the juvenile justice leadership in both your state and county support the scale-up efforts of JDAI?

	To a great extent	Somewhat	Very Little	Not at All	Don't Know
State juvenile justice leadership support of JDAI					
Local juvenile justice leadership support of JDAI					

15. Thinking of the leadership of JDAI at either the state or local level, please identify what sectors of the community are represented in the leadership team and what sectors of the community are not represented in the leadership team?

	Represented	Not Represented	Don't Know
Child Welfare			
Community Members (family, youth)			
District Attorney			
Education			
Health and Human Services			
Judges / Courts			
Law Enforcement			
Mental Health			
Non-Profit Organizations			
Probation Officers			
Prosecutors			
Substance Use			
Other (please specify):			

16. Have there been leadership changes in JDAI in your jurisdiction over the past year?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

17. If yes, what leadership changes have occurred? (open ended)

18. Please give an example of how JDAI leadership (e.g., steering committees, core strategy committees, coordinators, etc.) has influenced the scale up of JDAI in your state or jurisdiction? (open ended)

19. Thinking about the stakeholders, beyond the leadership team, involved in JDAI in your state or jurisdiction, how would you describe the level of engagement for each of the stakeholders representing the following sectors?

	Very Engaged	Engaged	Somewhat Engaged	Not Engaged	Don't Know
Child Welfare					
Community Members (family, youth)					
District Attorney					
Education					
Health and Human Services					
Judges / Courts					
Law Enforcement					
Mental Health					
Non-Profit Organizations					
Probation Officers					
Prosecutors					
Substance Use					
Other (please specify):					

Data Use

20. Please indicate how JDAI stakeholders in your community use data to make decisions about JDAI implementation.

	Yes	No	Don't Know
Conduct detention utilization studies			
Conduct system assessments			

	Yes	No	Don't Know
Disaggregate data by race and ethnicity			
Disseminate data to the public			
Regularly review updated data with a team or group of stakeholders			
Use data to make decisions about JDAI implementation			
Other (please specify):			

21. How often are these strategies used?

	Weekly	Monthly	Quarterly	Annually	Don't Know
Conduct detention utilization studies					
Conduct system assessments					
Disaggregate data by race and ethnicity					
Disseminate data to the public					
Regularly review updated data with a team or group of stakeholders					
Use data to make decisions about JDAI implementation					
Other (please specify):					

22. Is a risk assessment instrument used with youth when referred to a detention facility?

- Yes (*skip to #24*)
- No
- Don't Know (*skip to #27*)

23. If no, why not? (*open ended*) (*skip to #27*)

24. If yes, who uses the results from the tool? (*check all that apply*)

- Judges
- Case managers
- Probation
- Other (please specify): _____

25. If yes, how often is the risk assessment instrument used with youth at the time of referral to a detention facility?

- Always

- Very often
- Sometimes
- Rarely
- Never

26. If yes, to what extent has the risk assessment instrument changed the policy and practice of juvenile detention admissions?

- To a great extent
- Somewhat
- Very Little
- Not at all

27. Please share an example of a challenge you have faced using data related to JDAI. This example can be about challenges accessing data, using existing data or gaps in data availability. (open ended)

28. Please share an example of a success related to data use. (open ended)

Closing

29. What are the key lessons learned related to JDAI in your community? (open ended)

30. What are your goals for JDAI implementation and scale-up in the next five years? (open ended)

31. Any other comments you'd like to add about JDAI in your state? (open ended)