

Juvenile Justice Resource Series

Systems of Care Programs That Serve Youth Involved With the Juvenile Justice System

Funding and Sustainability



***Systems of Care Programs That Serve Youth
Involved With the Juvenile Justice System:***

Funding and Sustainability

**Kathleen R. Skowyra
Joseph J. Cocozza, Ph.D.
Jennie L. Shufelt, M.S.**

September 2010



About the Technical Assistance Partnership for Child and Family Mental Health

The Technical Assistance Partnership for Child and Family Mental Health (TA Partnership) provides technical assistance to system of care communities that are currently funded to operate the Comprehensive Community Mental Health Services for Children and Their Families Program. The mission of the TA Partnership is "helping communities build systems of care to meet the mental health needs of children, youth, and families."

This technical assistance center operates under contract from the federal Child, Adolescent and Family Branch, Center for Mental Health Services, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

The TA Partnership is a collaboration between two mission-driven organizations:

- The American Institutes for Research — committed to improving the lives of families and communities through the translation of research into best practice and policy, and
- The National Federation of Families for Children's Mental Health — dedicated to effective family leadership and advocacy to improve the quality of life of children with mental health needs and their families.

The TA Partnership includes family members and professionals with extensive practice experience employed by either the American Institutes for Research or the National Federation of Families for Children's Mental Health. Through this partnership, we model the family-professional relationships that are essential to our work. For more information on the TA Partnership, visit the Web site at <http://www.tapartnership.org>.

Suggested Citation:

Skowrya, K. R., Coccozza, J. J., & Shufelt, J. L. (2010). *Systems of Care Programs That Serve Youth Involved With the Juvenile Justice System: Funding and Sustainability*. Washington, DC: Technical Assistance Partnership for Child and Family Mental Health.

Forward

Each year, more than 2 million children, youth, and young adults formally come into contact with the juvenile justice system, while millions more are at risk of involvement with the system for myriad reasons (Puzzanchera, 2009; Puzzanchera & Kang, 2010). Of those children, youth, and young adults, a large number (65–70 percent) have at least one diagnosable mental health need, and 20–25 percent have serious emotional issues (Shufelt & Cocozza, 2006; Teplin, Abram, McClelland, Dulcan, & Mericle, 2002; Wasserman, McReynolds, Lucas, Fisher, & Santos, 2002). System of care communities focusing on meeting the mental health and related needs of this population through comprehensive community-based services and supports have the opportunity to not only develop an understanding around the unique challenges this population presents, but also to decide how best to overcome those challenges through planned and thoughtful programs, strong interagency collaboration, and sustained funding.

The Technical Assistance Partnership for Child and Family Mental Health (TA Partnership) recognizes the many challenges system of care communities face in working to better meet the needs of all of the children, youth, and young adults they serve. In an effort to help these communities meet the unique needs of young people involved or at risk of involvement with the juvenile justice system, the TA Partnership is releasing a resource series focused on this population. The TA Partnership has contracted with the National Center for Mental Health and Juvenile Justice (NCMHJJ) to produce this resource series, which contains three briefs. Each brief examines a unique aspect of serving this population within system of care communities.

The first brief, *Addressing the Mental Health Needs of Youth in Contact With the Juvenile Justice System in System of Care Communities*, provides an overview of the challenges many system of care communities face in working with children, youth, and young adults involved or at risk of involvement with the juvenile justice system and provides concrete examples of how some communities have overcome these challenges. The second brief, *Successfully Collaborating With the Juvenile Justice System: Benefits, Challenges, and Key Strategies*, takes a closer look at the importance of true collaboration between community-based child-serving agencies in providing a comprehensive array of services and supports and fostering positive outcomes for this population. Finally, the third brief, *Systems of Care Programs That Serve Youth Involved With the Juvenile Justice System: Funding and Sustainability*, explores ways in which communities can financially sustain the efforts they have in place to meet the needs of this population after the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) funding period has ended.

We hope that this resource series will support the planning and implementation of effective services, policies, and practices that improve outcomes for children, youth, and young adults involved or at risk of involvement with the juvenile justice system as well as their families.

Systems of Care Programs That Serve Youth Involved With the Juvenile Justice System: Funding and Sustainability

Overview

Programs and initiatives that are established with time-limited grant funding must eventually address questions of postgrant sustainability. In order to continue operating, these programs must identify and secure alternative funding, often from multiple funding sources with varying restrictions and requirements. This is true as well for the system of care communities in operation across the country (Koyanagi & Feres-Merchant, 2000). Weaving together myriad funding streams to sustain a program can be a challenging task for any community. The short-term nature of grant funding in general and the sizable amount of funds awarded through the system of care program, make securing sustainable, postgrant funding very challenging. This can be especially difficult for programs that serve youth involved with the juvenile justice system for a variety of reasons. First, there is a general lack of information about funding sources (federal, state, local, and private) that can be used to support juvenile justice–mental health partnerships, and a lack of practical information about how jurisdictions have used these funds to support collaborative programs (Lepler, Skowrya, & Coccozza, 2007). Second, systems of care may be less familiar with existing juvenile justice funding streams, requirements, restrictions, and expected outcomes, and this lack of familiarity makes it difficult to apply for funds. Finally, identifying *any* alternative funding is particularly challenging at times of economic uncertainty and government budget deficits (Wiig, Morris, Coccozza, & Shufelt, 2009).

Recognizing the challenges associated with sustainability, the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) has focused a substantial amount of effort on issues of sustainability, and has produced publications designed to assist the system of care sites in thinking about and planning for sustainability. In “For the Long Haul: Maintaining Systems of Care Beyond the Federal Investment,” for example, Koyanagi and Feres-Merchant (2000) recommend a number of strategies for ensuring postgrant financial security, including to begin sustainability planning early, revisit and revise the plan often, and ensure strong leadership. While these resources provide a helpful framework for thinking about general sustainability, they do not directly address some of the unique challenges associated with securing long-term sustainable funding within a mental health–juvenile justice context.

It is very likely that most system of care sites, on their point of “graduation” from SAMHSA funding, will need to have identified a variety of funding sources—entitlement and discretionary, from multiple systems—to successfully sustain their programs. This successful transition to alternative funding for programs that serve youth in contact with the juvenile justice system requires the development of a cross-agency sustainability plan. This brief describes the key elements associated with sustainability planning for mental health–juvenile justice collaborations, and details existing juvenile justice funding sources that could be tapped to support programs.

Sustainability Planning

Programs should begin thinking about sustainability early in the program planning and implementation process, allowing sufficient time to identify potential sustainability barriers and

options for minimizing those barriers (Wigg et al., 2009). Sustainability planning should involve key stakeholders from all involved agencies and systems. A broad cross-agency sustainability planning group will help ensure that all systems have a voice in the discussions and a responsibility for helping identify sources of continued program support. Responsibility for the continuation of a system of care that serves youth from multiple systems should be shared, with each system contributing to the process in some way. Collaborative sustainability planning has the added benefit of putting more funding options on the table, including funds available through the juvenile justice system.

The development of a collaborative sustainability plan for a system of care requires that the planning group engage in a long-term strategic planning process that addresses six critical elements through a series of targeted questions (National Center for Mental Health and Juvenile Justice, 2009). These elements and questions are presented below.

Program Capacity for Sustainability. In order to discuss and plan for the sustainability of a program, there must be a clearly-defined and well-structured program to sustain and a perceived need for the program in the community.

- Are the program's mission, goals, and objectives clearly articulated and specified?
- Are the key components and procedures of the program detailed in a manual?
- Has there been recognition of the need for such a program in the community?
- What aspects of the program are most important to sustain if it is not possible to maintain the entire program?

Effective Leadership. A strong leader and the involvement of key stakeholders help to the build broad support necessary for the continuation of programs.

- Is leadership committed to long-term involvement with the program?
- Is there support from key stakeholders in the community and among relevant agencies and providers?
- Is there a champion who can publicly advocate for the continuation of the program?

Cross-Agency System Collaboration. Given the fact that the systems of care targets or serves youth in contact with the juvenile justice system, a broad base of support is necessary.

- Are the relevant treatment and justice agencies involved with collaborating on the program?
- Are there formal interagency agreements in place that can be used as building blocks for maintaining the program?
- Are collaborators adequately involved in program design, implementation, and evaluation?
- Are there opportunities to integrate the program into other key program areas already in place in other agencies?

Demonstrated Outcomes. The ability to demonstrate positive outcomes and program effectiveness is crucial.

- What data exist that can be used to assess program effectiveness?
- What other information can be used to support the need for and effectiveness of the program?
- Have the evaluation findings been written up in an easy-to-read format?
- Have outcomes been communicated to stakeholders, collaborators, and potential funders?

Marketing Strategies. It is critical that any information regarding the importance and effectiveness of a program be visible and shared with key target groups.

- What products are available or could be developed that would help to disseminate information about the program?
- Have the target audience been identified for any marketing efforts?
- Has a marketing plan been developed?

Funding. An important factor in sustaining a program is the availability of funds.

- Has there been an analysis of the funding needed to maintain the program?
- Have potential funding sources been identified and researched?
- Are there available funding streams that can help to sustain the program in the future?
- Has a plan been developed to lay out funding strategies and evaluate options?

Funding Sources

Funding is among the most obvious factors necessary for program continuation. Critical to securing postgrant funding for system of care programs that serve youth in the juvenile justice system is understanding the range of funding sources available to support these programs. These funding sources may include traditional mental health funding sources that system of care programs are more likely to be familiar with, as well as funding streams that primarily target juvenile justice programs and services.

Medicaid. Medicaid is a federal entitlement program that is administered by states to fund covered health and mental health services for qualifying individuals (Hanlon, May, & Kaye, 2008). For youth, federal Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnosis, and Treatment regulations require that all states regularly assess and evaluate health and developmental problems in youth, and provide all Medicaid services allowable under federal law that address physical and mental illnesses and conditions discovered through those assessments (Hanlon et al., 2008). As a result, Medicaid is often an important source of funding for mental health services for youth.

At the same time, the use of Medicaid for youth in contact with the juvenile justice system presents some unique challenges that can inhibit a state's ability to serve this population. Most notably, federal law prohibits the use of federal Medicaid funds for "care or services for any

individual who is an inmate¹ of a public institution” (Social Security Act § 1905(a)(28)(A)). This restriction prevents the use of the federal Medicaid match for some youth in the juvenile justice system. However, federal Medicaid funds can continue to be used to pay for services for youth placed in eligible *private* institutions and for youth in community-based services. In addition, some states have interpreted the federal regulations to allow for the use of federal Medicaid funds for youth in detention who have not been adjudicated (Hanlon et al., 2008).

Furthermore, even for youth who are considered inmates of a public institution, there are a number of things that states can do to provide services to youth during and after that placement. First, states can, and are in fact encouraged to, choose *not* to terminate a youth’s enrollment in Medicaid. The restriction merely prevents the use of federal Medicaid funds to pay for services while the youth is an inmate of a public institution (Hanlon et al., 2008); the restriction does not require termination of a youth’s Medicaid enrollment. Second, because the restriction only prevents the use of the Federal Financial Participation for inmates of public institutions, states can continue to use the state-match portion of Medicaid dollars to pay for services (Kamradt, 2002).

Through a series of interviews conducted in five states in 2008, the National Academy for State Health Policy (NASHP) identified a number of other barriers and challenges to successfully using Medicaid for youth in the juvenile justice system. NASHP found that effectively meeting the needs of youth in the juvenile justice system was often impeded by (1) a lack of knowledge about services and policies across state agencies, as well as between state and local agencies, (2) a lack of information about service needs and utilization by youth served by these agencies, and (3) insufficient knowledge about Medicaid-eligible youth in the juvenile justice system. In addition, the interviews revealed that significant policy barriers, including Medicaid eligibility criteria, policies governing who can bill for services, the appropriate procedures for properly billing for those services, often impede effective service delivery for this population (Hanlon et al., 2008).

Although these barriers can represent significant impediments to effectively serving youth in the juvenile justice system, a number of strategies can reduce their impact, including the following:

- Improving interagency and intra-agency knowledge, particularly about Medicaid and the juvenile justice system. For example, NASHP recommends the use of umbrella entities to capitalize on collaborative approaches and implement cross-agency training programs.
- Strengthening Medicaid eligibility policies to ensure the participation of eligible youth. In particular, NASHP recommends the use of continuous or presumptive eligibility, expedited eligibility determinations for youth leaving secure placement, and the use of collaborative strategies, such as care coordinators and interagency agreements.
- Improving service coverage policies to ensure that eligible youth receive services by, for example, covering evidence-based practices, promoting early identification of mental health needs, ensuring provider continuity, and engaging in interagency service planning.
- Building and strengthening interagency collaboration (Hanlon et al., 2008).

¹ An inmate is one “serving time for a criminal offense or confined involuntarily in State or Federal prisons, jails, detention facilities, or other penal facilities.” 42 C.F.R. 441.33(a)(1), 435.1008(a)(1).

Juvenile Justice Funding. While traditional mental health funding sources, such as Medicaid, may provide partial support for mental health service provision, it is likely that system of care communities may want to seek some juvenile justice funding in order to sustain those services. Federal juvenile justice funding generally comes from either the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) or the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA). Many of these funding streams flow through, and are administered by, state governments. Major federal justice funding streams that could be used to support mental health-juvenile justice related projects include the following:

Formula Grants Program (OJJDP). Pursuant to the federal Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDP) of 1974, as amended, each state is required to establish a State Advisory Group (SAG) on Juvenile Justice, which develops a comprehensive state juvenile justice plan based on needs assessments conducted within the state. [Formula grant funds](#) are awarded to the states based on population. The SAGs have decisional authority over who receives the grant awards. However, the grants must support programs authorized in the JJDP; these include prevention and intervention efforts, as well as system improvement programs. The juvenile justice specialist in each state is responsible for processing the grants for award. Eligible program areas include the following:

- Community-based alternatives to detention
- Aftercare and reentry services
- Family-oriented programs, including community-based alternatives to incarceration
- Probation programs that allow youth to stay in their communities
- Diversion programs that prevent involvement with the juvenile justice system
- Substance abuse prevention and treatment for youth

Juvenile Accountability Block Grants Program (OJJDP). The [Juvenile Accountability Block Grant \(JABG\) Program](#) focuses on reducing juvenile offending through offender- and system-focused activities that promote accountability. State or local agencies designated by the governor of each state are eligible to apply for JABG funds. Allowable uses of grant funding include:

- Hiring probation officers and funding pretrial services, including mental health screening and assessment, for juveniles
- Establishing and maintaining programs to conduct risk and needs assessments that facilitate effective early intervention and provision of comprehensive services, including mental health screening and treatment, and substance abuse testing and treatment

Community Prevention Grants Program (OJJDP). The [Community Prevention Grants Program \(CPGP\)](#) funds the planning and implementation of collaborative, community-based delinquency prevention efforts. Prevention plans developed through the CPGP seek to reduce juvenile delinquency risk factors and reduce juvenile problem behavior. States award program funds to units of local government through a competitive process. Eligible program areas include the following:

- Diversion programs that place youth involved with the juvenile justice system into other service settings

- Delinquency prevention programs that prevent youth at risk for becoming delinquent from entering the juvenile justice system, or intervene with first-time offenders to prevent them from becoming more deeply involved with the system
- Mental health services that include psychological and psychiatric evaluations and treatment and family support services for juveniles at risk and those committing first-time, nonserious juvenile offenses

Justice and Mental Health Collaboration Program (BJA). The [Justice and Mental Health Collaboration Program](#) funds state- and county-based collaborations that jointly respond to the mental health needs of adults and juveniles in contact with the justice system. Since its inception, BJA has funded more than 100 collaborative programs and initiatives specifically targeting individuals with mental illness in the justice system. A significant proportion of these programs have focused on the juvenile justice population. Grants are available to support strategic planning, diversion, and juvenile mental health courts. Examples of efforts that have been supported through this funding include the following:

- *Tarrant County, TX:* A diversion program that expands the intervention services available to youth with mental health needs through the use of Deferred Prosecution Probation (DPP). The goals are to provide evidence-based treatments to diverted youth, encourage strong family participation in treatment planning and service delivery, expedite intervention services for youth with mental health needs, and improve linkages across systems.
- *St. Louis, MO:* The existing Juvenile Justice Initiative, which is a collaborative effort, is expanded through a preadjudicatory diversion program designed to improve the availability and access to community-based behavioral and mental health services for youth involved with juvenile court. The program screens, assesses, and refers youth to Multi-Systemic Therapy or other community-based mental health services.

Second Chance Act of 2007: Community Safety Through Recidivism Prevention (BJA). The Second Chance Act is designed to ensure that adults and juveniles returning to the community from correctional facilities have adequate support, services, and rehabilitation programs. The legislation authorizes [SCA demonstration](#) (PDF) grants to government agencies and nonprofit organizations to support the successful reentry of prisoners. Funds can be used for substance abuse and mental health treatment, in addition to a variety of other support services.

State and Local Funding. In addition to the federal funding streams that flow through the states, most states and counties have funding that originates from state or county tax revenue. It is vital that system of care sites looking to tap into these funds understand how each agency or point of contact within the juvenile justice continuum (intake, detention, juvenile court, juvenile placement, and probation) is administered and funded. A thorough sustainability plan should include an effort to map out the specific funding structure of the particular state and to understand how these funds are accessed. For those programs administered and funded by the state, it may be helpful to involve fiscal representatives from the state's juvenile justice system in sustainability planning efforts.

Private Funding. System of care programs may be able to secure program funding from private organizations and foundations. While these sources also come with funding time limits, they provide the opportunity for communities to benefit from extended periods of financial support.

The following are among several national and international foundations that have active grant-making programs and/or a history of grant making in the area of juvenile justice:

The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation. The [Models for Change initiative](#), supported by the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, is an effort to create successful and replicable models of juvenile justice reform through targeted investments in key states. Efforts within the initiative center around work in four states—Illinois, Louisiana, Pennsylvania, and Washington—which were strategically selected for their readiness for change, geographic diversity, and potential to influence reform across the country. Twelve additional states are participating in Models for Change through action networks focused on specific reform issues, including mental health, disproportionate minority contact, and juvenile indigent defense.

Annie E. Casey Foundation. The Annie E. Casey Foundation seeks to foster public policy, reforms, and community supports that meet the needs of vulnerable children and families. The foundation's juvenile justice grant making focuses primarily on juvenile detention. Through its [Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative \(JDAI\)](#), the Annie E. Casey Foundation seeks to minimize the inappropriate use of detention, encourage the development and use of community-based alternatives to detention, improve the conditions of confinement in detention, reduce racial disparities among youth in juvenile justice placements, and redirect public funding toward system reform.

Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (RWJF) focuses on improving the health and health care of Americans. The Foundation focuses on seven program areas. Through its Vulnerable Populations program area, the RWJF fosters the development of solutions that allow people to overcome social barriers to health and well-being. Under this program area, the Foundation funds more than 80 national programs, including [Reclaiming Futures: Communities Helping Teens Overcome Drugs, Alcohol and Crime](#), which is an effort to bring communities together to improve substance abuse treatment and services to break the cycle of drugs, alcohol, and crime.

Eckerd Family Foundation. The [Eckerd Family Foundation](#) works to promote and provide better care for delinquent youth by supporting systemic changes to ensure that youth are properly assessed and placed, that they receive effective treatment, and are able to return to their communities. Grant making supports the foundation's efforts to promote diversion, assessment, and treatment to have a positive impact on the lives of youth who are at risk for becoming involved or are already involved with the juvenile justice system.

Edna McConnell Clark Foundation. The [Edna McConnell Clark Foundation](#) seeks to make a difference in the lives of disadvantaged individuals by making investments in the development and growth of nonprofit organizations with proven programs that help low-income youth make successful transitions to independent and productive adulthood.

In addition to national foundations, system of care communities should seek out state or local foundations that may fund programs for youth in the juvenile justice system. There are numerous state- or county-specific foundations that engage in juvenile justice grant making within a particular geographic area. Examples include

- The [Tow Foundation](#), located in Connecticut, engages in grant making and advocacy with the goal of improving the way that youth who come before the court system in Connecticut are treated.
- The [Hogg Foundation for Mental Health](#), located in Texas, makes grants for projects that promote mental health and mental health care for residents of Texas.

For additional information on state and local foundations, visit the [Foundation Center](#), a national nonprofit organization that maintains a comprehensive database on U.S. grant makers and their grants. The Web site also contains a state-by-state database of grant-making institutions.

Other Strategies for Securing Sustainable Funding

In addition to understanding the various sources of support, system of care sites can take a number of steps to increase the likelihood of securing juvenile justice funding.

Ensure meaningful collaboration with the juvenile justice system early on. Clearly, a trend is emerging within the federal government to require that agencies collaborate as a condition of application and funding. While SAMHSA has consistently emphasized collaboration across the mental health, juvenile justice, and other federal child-serving systems among system of care applicants, other agencies are now requiring partnership. The Bureau of Justice Assistance, which has emerged as a major source of funds for mental health-justice related collaborations, specified in its 2010 grant announcement that it will only accept applications that demonstrate that the proposed project will be administered jointly by a unit of government with responsibility for criminal or juvenile justice and a mental health agency (U.S. Department of Justice, 2010). The U.S. Department of Education, in its 2010 solicitation for grants for the integration of schools and mental health systems, specified that the required partners for all applications include the state or local educational agency, the state or local mental health agency, and the local juvenile justice authority (U.S. Department of Education, 2010). When the juvenile justice system is brought to the table as a meaningful collaborator early in program planning, and is involved in thinking about issues of sustainability from the beginning, it is more likely to share responsibility for the long-term maintenance of the program through support and fiscal accountability (Koyanagi & Feres-Merchant, 2000).

Incorporate juvenile justice outcomes into program design and outcome evaluations.

Programs that can demonstrate that they have a positive impact on outcomes that are important to the juvenile justice system, such as reductions in recidivism, reduced risk for violence or reoffending, or reduced substance use, are more likely to succeed in securing juvenile justice funding. Therefore, system of care programs should work with the juvenile justice system early to design programs that ensure that these outcomes, along with mental health-related outcomes, are addressed in program implementation and captured by outcome evaluations. The ability to demonstrate changes in these outcomes will go a long way toward securing juvenile justice funding when grant money ends.

Collect cost-effectiveness information about the program. State and local juvenile justice agencies are more likely to be willing to part with scarce resources if the program can demonstrate cost savings in the form of reduced out-of-home placements. Wraparound Milwaukee, for example, has monitored and reported the cost savings resulting from avoided

residential placements, and has used these data to build program support and make the case for continued funding support and program expansion. A great resource for information on cost-benefit analysis is the [Washington State Institute for Public Policy](#), which conducts policy and fiscal analysis in key areas like child welfare, juvenile justice, and mental health. In particular, the institute has extensive cost-benefit evaluations on the effectiveness of evidence-based mental health treatments versus traditional correctional programs for youth and adults.

Conclusion

Collaborative sustainability planning is essential for systems of care whose programs will eventually have to make the transition from SAMHSA grant funds to alternative sources of funding. This planning should start early and involve representatives from all child-serving systems involved with the system of care to ensure that a broad range of transitional options are considered. For systems of care that serve youth in contact with the juvenile justice system, sustainability planning should include a review of available federal, state, local, and private juvenile justice funding streams that could be accessed to secure program continuation.

This resource series is intended to provide system of care sites with information, practical advice, and strategies for responding to the large numbers of youth with mental health needs in contact with the juvenile justice system. This series includes the following publications:

- “Addressing the Mental Health Needs of Youth in Contact With the Juvenile Justice System in System of Care Communities: An Overview and Summary of Key Issues”
- “Successfully Collaborating With the Juvenile Justice System: Benefits, Challenges, and Key Strategies”
- “System of Care Programs That Serve Youth Involved With the Juvenile Justice System: Funding and Sustainability”

References

- Hanlon, C., May, J., & Kaye, N. (2008). *A multi-agency approach to using Medicaid to meet the mental health needs of juvenile justice-involved youth*. Washington, DC: The National Academy for State Health Policy. Retrieved from http://www.nashp.org/sites/default/files/Multi_Agency_NASHP.pdf on July 15, 2010.
- Kamradt, B. (2002). *Funding mental health services for youth in the juvenile justice system: Challenges and opportunities*. Delmar, NY: National Center for Mental Health and Juvenile Justice. Retrieved from http://www.ncmhjj.com/pdfs/publications/Funding_Mental_Health_Services.pdf on July 15, 2010.
- Koyanagi, C., & Feres-Merchant, D. (2000). For the long haul: Maintaining systems of care beyond the federal investment. Washington, DC: Center for Effective Collaboration and Practice, American Institutes for Research. Retrieved from <http://download.ncadi.samhsa.gov/ken/pdf/2000monographs/vol3.pdf> on July 15, 2010.
- Lepler, S., Skowrya, K., & Coccozza, J. (2007). *Blueprint for change: Funding mental health services for youth in contact with the juvenile justice system*. Delmar, NY: National Center for Mental Health and Juvenile Justice. Retrieved from <http://www.ncmhjj.com/pdfs/BlueprintFunding.pdf> on July 15, 2010.
- National Center for Mental Health and Juvenile Justice. (2009, October). *Sustainability planning workbook*. Workbook presented to participants at the 2009 John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation Models for Change Mental Health/Juvenile Justice Action Network Annual Meeting, Seattle, WA.
- Social Security Act §1905(a)(28)(A). As amended and related enactments through January 1, 2007.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2010). *Grants for the integration of schools and mental health systems*. CFDA#84.215M. Released January 8, 2010.
- U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance. (2010). *Justice and mental health collaboration program*. BJA-2010-2516. Released February 9, 2010.
- Wiig, J., Morris, J., Coccozza, J., & Shufelt, J. (2009, December). *Sustainability frame for models for change sites*. Paper presented at the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation's Fourth Annual Models for Change Conference, Washington, DC.

Appendix A: Additional Resources

1. The Annie E. Casey Foundation
<http://www.aecf.org/Home/OurWork/JuvenileJustice/JuvenileJusticeOverview.aspx>
2. Bureau of Justice Assistance, Justice and Mental Health Collaboration Program Information
<http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/BJA/grant/JMHCprogram.html>
3. Bureau of Justice Assistance, Understanding the Second Chance Act
http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/BJA/grant/SCA_Demonstration_Grants.pdf
4. Edna McConnell Clark Foundation
www.emcf.org
5. Eckerd Family Foundation
www.eckerdfamilyfoundation.org
6. Foundation Center
www.foundationcenter.org
7. The Hogg Foundation for Mental Health
www.hogg.utexas.edu
8. The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation Models for Change Initiative
www.modelsforchange.net
9. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Community Prevention Grants Program Summary
<http://ojjdp.ncjrs.gov/cpg/index.html>
10. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Formula Grants Program Summary
<http://ojjdp.ncjrs.gov/programs/ProgSummary.asp?pi=16&ti=&si=&kw=&PreviousPage=ProgResults#Overview>
11. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Juvenile Accountability Block Grants Program Summary
<http://www.ojjdp.ncjrs.gov/jabg/>
12. Robert Wood Johnson Foundation
www.reclaimingfutures.org
13. Tow Foundation
www.towfoundation.org
14. Washington State Institute for Public Policy
www.wsipp.wa.gov