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Timeline of Juvenile Drug Courts

- **1990s** Increasing Recognition of SUD in Criminal Court and then Juvenile Court Populations

- **2000s** Expansion of Juvenile Drug Courts
  - 2003 Juvenile Drug Courts: Strategies in Practice

- **Now** Increased recognition of COD
  - Focus on evidence-based treatment
  - Emergence of Integrated Treatment Models
Disproportionate Presence of Youth with Behavioral Health Disorders in Juvenile Justice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevalence of Mental Disorders- Findings From Recent Studies</th>
<th>Positive Diagnosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NCMHJJ (2006)</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teplin et al. (2002)</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasserman et al. (2002)</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasserman, Ko, McReynolds (2004)</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multiple and Complex Disorders are the Norm

- ~ 60 percent of youth with MHD also had SUD (NCMHJJ, 2006)

- Among youth who have received mental health treatment, estimates of lifetime co-occurring substance abuse range from 24% to 50%

- Among youth who have received substance abuse treatment, estimates of lifetime co-occurring mental health disorders range from 59% to 87%

- About 27% of justice-involved youth have disorders serious enough to require immediate and significant treatment
Key Decisions in Building COD Capacity

- Identifying Key Stakeholders and Partners
- Establish Eligibility and Exclusion Criteria
- Establish Policies: Termination, Sanction, Graduation
- Articulation of Roles and Responsibilities
- Policies regarding Exchanges of Information
- Protocol for Evidence-Based Screening for MHD, SUD
- Procedures for Integrated Assessment of MHD, SUD
- Referral for Evidence-Based Integrated Treatment
- Data Collection, Evaluation and Outcome Analysis
Why Integrated Treatment?

- Unrecognized/untreated mental health disorders reduce likelihood for achieving successful outcomes (reduced engagement & retention)

- Integrated treatment for co-occurring disorders is more effective – both problems are treated at the same time

- Few integrated treatment options available for youth with COD until recently
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Prevalence of co-occurring mental health and substance abuse disorders: Clinical Samples

- Among mental health treatment samples, estimates of lifetime co-morbid substance abuse samples range from 24% to 50%.

- Among youth who have received substance abuse treatment, estimates of lifetime co-occurring psychiatric disorder range from 59% to 87%; 62% (Hussey); 67% (Dennis).

- 45 to 49% of youth treated for substance use disorders also have co-occurring psychiatric disorders (Tenn Care).

- Treatment and research on this population are not commensurate with the high prevalence.
Problems are Multiple and Complex

- Multiple problems (5+) are the norm (Dennis, 2005)

- Trauma and victimization in 62 to 80% of youth (Dennis; Hussey)

- Most youth have multiple system involvement and problems (juvenile justice (81%); schools; family; peers)

- Treatment engagement and retention are difficult, and intervention outcomes tend to be poor, (Hawkins, 2009, p.206)."

- Chronic relapsing disorder, requiring multiple treatment attempts over time (White and Dennis)

- Is Multiple-Occurring Conditions a better frame?
Influence, Interaction, and Manifestation of Multiple Occurring Conditions
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Core Assumptions

1. Youth with COD present with multiple and complex symptom patterns and behaviors, which adversely affects their functioning in developmentally important life domains.

2. Sustained recovery often takes multiple treatment attempts over time.

3. COD presentation in youth is affected by brain development; and conversely, brain development is impacted by substance use.

4. Contextual factors (peers, family, school, neighborhood, and the risk and protective factors associated with them) play a mediating role in youth behaviors, use patterns, and recovery trajectory.

5. The stressors associated with co-occurring disorders negatively strain family emotional, interpersonal, and material resources.
Weighing the Costs

“The question is not whether we can afford to invest in every child; it is whether we can afford not to.”  Mariann Wright Edelman

- Estimate the present value of saving a 14-year-old high risk juvenile from a life of crime to range from $2.6 to $5.3 million

From: New Evidence on the Monetary Value of Saving a High Risk Youth (Cohen & Piquero, 2008; p. 25)
## Fiscal Impact for System Stakeholders (2008 Ohio Data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Placement Type</th>
<th>Average Cost Per Diem</th>
<th>Annualized Cost</th>
<th>System(s) Impacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foster Care  Level IV</td>
<td>$123.90</td>
<td>$45,224</td>
<td>Child Welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Home</td>
<td>$125</td>
<td>$45,625</td>
<td>Child Welfare; Juvenile Courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Treatment (non-secure)</td>
<td>$200.56</td>
<td>$73,204</td>
<td>Child Welfare; Juvenile Courts; School Systems; Mental Health; Substance Abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Treatment (secure)</td>
<td>$335</td>
<td>$122,275</td>
<td>Child Welfare; Juvenile Courts; School Systems; Mental Health; Substance Abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Commitment</td>
<td>$338</td>
<td>$122,356 (11.9 months)</td>
<td>ODYS; Local Juvenile Courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT (average cost per treatment episode)</td>
<td>$7,500- 9,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Negative Aspects of Placement

- Youth may learn additional negative, sometimes more destructive behaviors
- Detrimental to child and family bonds
- Family not normally a part of treatment
- Transitional delays in receiving services (medication)
- Lost education time
- Research does not support effectiveness
- Financial cost to community
It takes a community ....

- Shared burden - shared risk
- No single system can manage the multiple issues of at-risk youth and their families alone
- Mutual responsibilities: we all play a role
  - Youth and family
  - Providers
  - Child-Serving Systems
  - Community (supports)
Service to Science Development

**Phase One**
- **Initial Model Development:** U. of Akron, 1999
  - Naturalistic progression based on community need. Expert panel; focus groups; youth and family

**Phase Two**
- **Pilot Implementation:** 2001-2005
  - Model refinement; small comparison study. High family and community saliency.

**Phase Three**
- **Multiple Site Implementation:** 2005-Present
  - Initial research study: 2005-2008
  - Model refinement

**Phase Four:** Develop Increasing Research Support
ICT utilizes an integrated treatment approach, embedded in an intensive home-based service delivery model, to provide both mental health and substance abuse treatment services to youth with co-occurring disorders of substance use and serious emotional disability and their families. Services are provided in the home, school and community where the youth lives, with the goal of safely maintaining the youth in the least restrictive, most normative environment.

Main Purpose:
- Placement prevention
- Reunification
- Stabilization and safety
ICT Model Components

- Intensive Home-Based Service Delivery Modality
- Systemic Engagement and Change
- Multidimensional and Integrated Assessment and Conceptualization
- Comprehensive and Integrated Treatment Array Matched to Needs and Strengths

System of Care Principles

Resiliency-Oriented Developmental Perspective
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Service</th>
<th>Home and Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intensity</td>
<td>Frequency: 2 to 5 sessions per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duration: 4 to 8 hours per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis response &amp; availability; active safety planning and monitoring</td>
<td>24/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active safety planning &amp; monitoring</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small caseloads</td>
<td>4 to 6 families per FTE; 8 to 12 for team of two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible scheduling</td>
<td>Convenient to family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment duration</td>
<td>3 to 6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemic engagement and community teaming</td>
<td>Child and family teaming; skillful advocacy;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>family partnering; culturally mindful engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active clinical supervision &amp; oversight</td>
<td>24/7 availability; field support; individual &amp; group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program structure and credentials</td>
<td>Licensed BSW and above; MA preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program size: 4 to 8; .5 to 1 FTE IHBT Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive service array</td>
<td>Crisis stabilization, safety planning, skill building, trauma-focused, family-focused; resiliency &amp; support-building interventions; cognitive interventions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multidimensional and Integrated Contextual Assessment

I. **Symptom Patterns and Diagnoses:** youth who meet the criteria for both Mental Health and Substance Use diagnoses

II. **Contextual Functioning:** Degree of functional impairment per life domain

III. **Developmental and Cognitive Functioning:** (cognitive functioning, emotional, & behavioral maturity)

IV. **Risk and Recovery Environments:** Environmental risk and recovery conditions (e.g. trauma, safety, negative influences, family conflict, poverty)

The youth’s functioning and COD patterns are determined by integrating these areas in context of the other and as a collective whole.
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Integrated Contextual Functional Analysis
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ICT Core Services

- Crisis Intervention and Stabilization
- Case management-oriented activities to meet basic needs
- Individually-Focused Interventions
- Family-Focused Interventions
- Cross-System Interventions
- Resource and support building activities
Integrated and Comprehensive Treatment Matched to Need

Youth and Family Need Hierarchy (Shepler, 1991, 1999)
Target Outcomes

Increase functioning in major life contexts so that the youth is:

- Living at home or in a permanent home setting
- Attending and achieving at school/work
- Reduced involvement in the JJ system
- Reduced use/no use of substances
- Participating in positive family, peer, and community life
- Improved family recovery environment
- Accessing resources and natural supports as needed to maintain gains and prevent recidivism
Integrated Co-Occurring Treatment Logistics

- Dually certified agency; dually licensed supervisor
- 2 to 4 FTE clinical staff either dually licensed or dually trained, with mix of SU and MH expertise on the team
- Consultation, training, and technical support:
  - Provide initial and booster trainings
  - Provide regular consultation and coaching of ICT Team
- Years 3+:
  - ICT Supervisor Monitors Fidelity
  - Consultation negotiated based on need
  - Yearly fidelity review
Funding Intensive Home Based Programs

- ICT is typically funded through a combination of Medicaid, insurance, and cross-system funding.

- Unique aspects of intensive home-based service delivery models that are more costly
  - Extensive supervision and consultation time involved;
  - Small caseloads;
  - Travel time required to deliver the service in the natural environment; and
  - On-call coverage;

- All of which decrease the amount of time in a week for billable services.
ICT RESEARCH
National Recognition

- **SAMHSA’s 2010 Science and Service Award**: a national program that recognizes community-based organizations and coalitions that have shown exemplary implementation of evidence-based mental health and substance abuse interventions. Given to McHenry County for its implementation of ICT for their SAMHSA SOC grant.

- **NIATx iAward (2010)** given by the State Association of Addiction Services and NIATx: Family Service and Community Mental Health Center located in McHenry County, Illinois received a 2010 iAward for Innovation in Behavioral Healthcare Services for its successful implementation of Integrated Co-Occurring Treatment (ICT).

- **Blueprint for Change: A Comprehensive Model for the Identification and Treatment of Youth with Mental Health Needs in Contact with the Juvenile**: One of the programs chosen by the National Center for Mental Health and Juvenile Justice to be highlighted as a promising practice in this OJJDP supported monograph.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current ICT Sites</th>
<th>Federal Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summit County, Ohio</td>
<td>Byrne; JAIBG 2001-2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McHenry County, Illinois</td>
<td>SAMHSA System of Care: 2008-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin County, Ohio</td>
<td>Re-Entry: 2011-2012;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalamazoo County, Michigan</td>
<td>SAMHSA System of Care: 2006-2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana (Helena and Missoula)</td>
<td>SAT-ED 2013- current</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Results of ICT Study (2001-2002)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICT Youth</th>
<th>Usual Services Comparison Group</th>
<th>Size of Difference in commitment and/or recidivism rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o 56 youth</td>
<td>o 19 Youth</td>
<td>Chi Square (1, 19): 3.338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o 25% recidivism rate</td>
<td>o 47% commitment rate</td>
<td>Level of significance: (p one-tailed = .034)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi Square (1, 19): 3.338
Level of significance: (p one-tailed = .034)
Recent ICT Study

- Real world study: Utilized naturally occurring comparison groups from a specialized co-occurring court
  - Due to ethical concerns, randomization into groups was not allowed

- All youth received the co-occurring court’s intensive probation program

- Compared ICT to traditional non-integrated services (TAU)

- ICT group had significantly more problems at admission than TAU group

- Randomized controlled study with follow-up needed to confirm results
### Positive Results:
**Improvement Over Time**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Youth Considered Together</th>
<th>ICT Did Better than TSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Substance use variables</td>
<td>- Substance Use Variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(GRAD; Drug Screens)</td>
<td>(GRAD; Drug Screens)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mental health variables:</td>
<td>- Mental Health Problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ohio Scales; GRAD)</td>
<td>Severity: (GRAD only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Family/Parenting (GRAD)</td>
<td>- Pro-Social Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Pro-Social Activities</td>
<td>(GRAD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(GRAD)</td>
<td>- Pro-Social Peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Educational Functioning</td>
<td>(GRAD-Parent Rating)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(GRAD)</td>
<td>- Family/Parenting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(GRAD-Youth Rating)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ICT showed a significant decrease in substance use, as measured by the GRAD Substance Use/Abuse Scale, as compared to TSS ($p < 0.001$)
ICT showed a significant decrease in mental health problem severity, as measured by the GRAD Personality/Behavior Scale, compared to TSS \((p < 0.014)\)
Realistic Outcomes and Expectations

- Think trajectory of wellness not cure
- Youth living with mental health and substance use disorders often have ongoing treatment and/or support needs
- Substance use is a chronic relapsing disorder (Dennis)
  - Completion rates low/High rate of treatment drop-out.
  - About half of adolescents treated report no use after treatment
- Measure what you do: risk reduction across life domains
  - Track multiple outcomes
- Conversation with key stakeholders about realistic outcome expectations (increased functioning; decreased level of care needs; etc.)
What we have learned

- Engagement and motivation to change is slower
- Optimal effects are more likely to be achieved using interventions that impact youth behaviors, family systems, peer relationships, and school functioning.
- Focus on risk reduction and symptom stabilization across life domains
- Intensive clinical supports are needed to help manage risk and safety (active safety planning and monitoring, and have 24-hour on-call availability to the youth and family)
- Look for treatment programs that offer both substance use and mental health approaches delivered in home and community environments such as ICT, Multisystemic Therapy (MST), Functional Family Therapy-CMT (FFT-CMT), Multidimensional Family Therapy (MDFT).
- Traditional adult-oriented programs, such as twelve step programs, may not be developmentally appropriate for youth with co-occurring disorders. Try recovery mentors.
Intersection of Treatment and Court

- Leveraging the influence of the court in combination with effective treatments leads to better outcomes
- Managing risk and safety issues of high-risk youth in the community requires active collaboration and coordination between service providers, the family, and the court (consider utilizing Wraparound process format)
  - Community service coordination planning can be incorporated into court orders.
  - Coordinated teaming efforts increases community accountability to a unified plan for the youth.
  - Clinically-informed judicial decision making: Can utilize the clinical information provided to make informed decisions about youth
  - Utilize regularly scheduled staffing/teaming between service providers and juvenile justice team for purpose of problem-solving and developing creative solutions
- Resolve infrastructure issues prior to implementing new programs (integrated funding and paperwork requirements)
Limitations of Communication

- Be cognizant that federal law 42CFR Part 2 is the most restrictive confidentiality law for treatment professionals and limits what treatment professionals can say about a client’s substance use without appropriate releases or unless court ordered.
Effective intervention practices and programs
+
Effective implementation practices
= Good outcomes for children and their families

No other combination of factors reliably produces desired outcomes for children, families, and caregivers
NIRN
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