2008-2009 Reintegration Framework

Systems Planning Toolkit

REINTEGRATION FRAMEWORK PROJECT

A collaborative effort of the Minnesota Department of Education and
The Evaluation Group at the Institute on Community Integration,
University of Minnesota

Findings reported by Minnesota's Self-Assessment Steering Committee indicate that children and youth with disabilities exiting correctional centers, chemical dependency programs, or other separate treatment sites do not receive coordinated interagency support. As noted in Minnesota's Self-Improvement Plan (2002), "one of the major factors that contribute to high recidivism rates, behavioral regression, school failure, and drop-outs is the lack of adequate transition service support for children and youth exiting separate sites" (p. 14). To increase the successful reintegration of youth with disabilities from separate sites and to improve their transition outcomes (e.g., decreased dropout, suspension, and expulsion rates), the Care and Treatment Reintegration Work Group created a document that provides information on best practices and indicators of successful transition/reintegration of children and youth between separate sites.

The Evaluation Group at the Institute on Community Integration, University of Minnesota, adapted and updated the work done by the Reintegration Work Group to develop the *Reintegration Framework* and the *Reintegration Framework Strategic Planning Toolkit*. The *Reintegration Framework* consists of the following five Framing Areas, each with accompanying indicators:

- Interagency Collaboration (10 Indicators)
- Team Planning (5 Indicators)
- Education (10 Indicators)
- Supporting Life Skills (6 Indicators)
- Continuity During and Post Transition (8 Indicators)

The *Reintegration Framework Strategic Planning Toolkit* contains a self-assessment tool, a priority-setting tool, and an action planning tool. The development of these tools was grounded in theory and previous research, including theories on: (1) participants in the planning process and their receptiveness to proposed innovations; (2) the conditions that support and promote interagency collaboration in the processes of self-review, consensus-building, planning, and evaluation; and (3) theoretical perspectives on the planning process itself. The *Reintegration Framework Strategic Planning Toolkit* provides a strong, structured basis for the self-assessment, priority setting, and action planning components, which is essential to building a unified direction for improvement efforts among diverse school and community partners.

The goals of the Reintegration Framework Project are:
1. to develop and evaluate a reintegration framework that identifies "best practices" that promote the transition and reintegration of children and youth placed for care and treatment; and
2. to develop and evaluate a systems-level strategic planning process, which is designed to: (a) strengthen interagency collaboration, (b) improve understanding of the current system, (c) identify areas for improvement, (d) promote planning and continuous improvement, and (e) engage interagency teams in an action planning process.

During 2008-2009, the Reintegration Framework Project will work with eight sites to implement the *Reintegration Framework* and the accompanying strategic planning process. Participating sites will form an interagency strategic planning team and engage in a strategic planning process using the *Reintegration Framework Strategic Planning Toolkit.* Sites will also be asked to participate in an evaluation component. Participants will be asked to reflect on the indicators, the process, and outcomes for sites, staff, and students in order to determine whether project goals have been met.

Disclaimer

The indicators and strategic planning process presented here are meant to be advisory only and do not constitute legal advice or represent an official legal position of the Minnesota Department of Education or of The Evaluation Group at the Institute on Community Integration, University of Minnesota. School Districts and individuals are responsible for compliance with state and federal law. Any contrary statements or incorrect information presented here do not negate the provisions of law.

Acknowledgements

The Evaluation Group would like to thank David R. Johnson, director of the Institute on Community Integration at the University of Minnesota, and the National Alliance for Secondary Education and Transition (NASET) for giving this project permission to use and adapt the strategic planning tools developed for the *NASET National Standards and Quality Indicators: Transition Toolkit for Systems Improvement* (NASET, 2005).

In addition, we would like to acknowledge the earlier work of the Minnesota Department of Education's Care and Treatment Reintegration Work Group in the initial development of the *Reintegration Framework*. The indicators and strategic planning tools presented in this revised version of the *Reintegration Framework* were identified and/or adapted through discussions with professionals in the field and a review of best practices found in the literature. The following is a list of key resources that were utilized in this process:

- Aos, S. (2004). *Family Integrated Transitions Program for juvenile offenders: Outcome evaluation and benefit-cost analysis.* Olympia: Washington State Institute for Public Policy.

- Coffey, O., & Gemignani, M. (1994). *Effective practices in juvenile correctional education: A study of the literature and research 1980-1992.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

- Ingersoll, S., & LeBoeuf, D. (1997). *Reaching out to Youth Out of the Education Mainstream* (Juvenile Justice Bulletin). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

- JustChildren. (2004). *A summary of best practices in school reentry for incarcerated youth returning home.* Charlottesville, VA: Legal Aid Justice Center.

- National Alliance for Secondary Education and Transition. (2005). *National standards and quality indicators: Transition toolkit for systems improvement.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, National Center on Secondary Education and Transition.

- National Center on Education Disability and Juvenile Justice (EDJJ). *Promising practices in transition for youth in the juvenile justice system: Long term correctional facilities; Short term jails*

and detention centers from http://www.edjj.org/focus/TransitionAfterCare/docs/longterm.pdf and http://www.edjj.org/focus/TransitionAfterCare/docs/shortterm.pdf

- National Collaboration for Youth. (2006). *Service coordination strengthens youth reentry*. Retrieved from http://www.collab4youth.org/ncy/cjj.htm

- Riley, P., & McDaniel, J. (1999). *Youth Out of the Education Mainstream: A North Carolina profile* (Juvenile Justice Bulletin). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

- Stephens, R. D., & Arnette, J. L. (2000). *From the courthouse to the schoolhouse: Making successful transitions* (Juvenile Justice Bulletin). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Strategic plan   Wide-ranging and long term intentions of an organization are usually laid out in a written document. The intentions are often arrayed in a descending hierarchy from intended conceptual outcomes to specific action steps. Terms used to describe the hierarchical elements vary from organization to organization, are defined differently, and may include some, but not necessarily all of the following: vision, mission, priority, goal, strategy, objective, action step, success indicator, and sometimes a slogan or tag line.

Priority   The focus for resource investment; an area of endeavor, stakeholder group, customer group, strategy, or other element of your organization's work that is targeted for special emphasis. A priority is sometimes time-bound, as in *2007 priorities* or *five-year priorities.* Some priorities apply to all or most activities, for example, *quality*, *accountability*, or *cost containment*. Other priorities focus staff and other resources on one or some of the goals or objectives, as in *priority goals v. secondary goals*.

Goal   One of a number of results that, taken together, are expected to achieve the vision. A goal statement may include one or more: (a) actions, (b) targets of the actions, (c) qualifiers or quantifiers, and (d) time-references.

Strategy   One of a number of approaches to achieving a goal. A strategy statement is usually expressed in general terms.

Action step   One of a number of specific steps or tasks that, taken together, are expected to achieve an objective. An action step statement generally includes: who will do what by when, in specific terms.

Success indicator   What will be examined to determine the success of a goal or an objective.

Slogan/Tag line   A short statement or phrase by which the vision can be easily communicated, understood, and remembered by target audiences.

Customers   People who use or benefit from your organization's products and services.

Stakeholders   People who have an interest in your organization's products and services; whose own well-being or effectiveness relies on your organization's products and services.

Partners   People who are actively engaged with your organization in achieving shared goals.

Reintegration Framework Strategic Planning Toolkit
Facilitator Guide

- Identify and recruit members for your Interagency Strategic Planning Team
- Members could include: special education teachers; probation officers; mental health workers; transition social workers/specialists; staff from workforce development centers, community non-profits (YMCA), the county (case worker or supervisor), the receiving school (counselor, teacher)
- Inform potential members of the time commitment (they will be asked to attend a minimum of three strategic planning meetings, as well as subsequent meetings to monitor progress on the strategic action plan, and they will be asked to participate in the evaluation component of this project)
- Arrange appropriate meeting space and determine best day/time for all team members to meet
- Determine if team members will complete the Self-Assessment Tool prior to the first meeting. If so, send them electronic or paper copies at least one week in advance. Team leaders may wish to review facilitation and consensus-building techniques. For useful resources, visit MDE's Division of Compliance and Assistance Web site at: http://education.state.mn.us/MDE/Accountability_Programs/Compliance_and_Assistance/Training_Materials/011409

  or visit the University of Minnesota Extension Service Web sites at: http://www.extension.umn.edu/distribution/citizenship/DH7433.html#overview or http://www.extension.umn.edu/distribution/citizenship/DH7437.html

SCHEDULE AND HOLD FIRST MEETING

Schedule Recommendation:

One recommendation is that Interagency Strategic Planning Team members complete the self-assessment on their own before the first meeting. The first meeting can then focus on team building and coming to consensus on the group ratings of the indicators. During the second meeting, the team can work on the priority setting tool and determine indicators or areas that the team will work on for the year. The third meeting can be focused on working out the details of the action plan (including task, person responsible, and timelines for completion).

However, you may modify this schedule depending on when and how long your team is available to meet. Subsequent meetings and/or conference calls will be necessary to monitor progress and to participate in the evaluation component.

At the First Meeting: Begin with a Review of Purpose and Process

❑ Review purpose of the *Reintegration Framework Project*. Make sure team members know why they are there (i.e., to participate in the implementation of the *Reintegration Framework Project* at your site and to develop a plan for improved transition/reintegration outcomes).
❑ Review the process that will be used (both the strategic planning process and the project's evaluation component).
❑ Review ground-rules for group participation.

Complete the Self-Assessment Tool

❑ Using the *Reintegration Framework Self-Assessment Tool*, ask Interagency Strategic Planning Team partners to identify the extent to which each indicator is evident within their site or local community.
❑ Instruct team members to use the four-point rating scale (Always Evident = 3, Usually Evident = 2, Seldom Evident = 1, Not Evident = 0) to assess the status of each indicator. This step can be done prior to the first meeting or individually at the start of the first meeting.
❑ Then, as a group, have team members communicate their individual ratings to each other and come to agreement on a single rating for each indicator.
❑ Record this rating (3, 2, 1, or 0) in the column labeled Group Self-Assessment Rating. Space for comments is provided at the bottom of the first page of each framing area.
❑ As much as possible, each site should record the evidence they used to determine whether an indicator was always evident, usually evident, seldom evident, or not evident. Forms will be provided for teams to record this information.

SCHEDULE AND HOLD SECOND MEETING

At the Second Meeting: Begin with a Review of Progress

❑ Review results of the steps completed during the first meeting.
❑ Check in with the group to ensure that everyone feels they have had a chance to give input; at this time, the group should consider any suggestions or concerns discussed by a team member.
❑ Review the agenda and process that will be used to complete the *Reintegration Framework Priority Setting Tool*.
❑ Briefly review ground-rules for group participation.

Complete the Priority Setting Tool

❑ Using the *Reintegration Framework Priority Setting Tool*, the Interagency Strategic Planning Team should first identify the extent to which each indicator is important by rating each indicator high, mid, or low importance.
❑ Team members then rate the priority for improvement based on the level of importance and the Group Self-Assessment Rating. For example, an indicator that receives a high

level of importance rating and a low self-assessment score may warrant a high level of priority for improvement rating.

❑ Record individual and team importance and priority for improvement ratings. The next step is to reach consensus on the highest priorities identified.

❑ This step often requires a facilitated discussion to examine the range and variation of individual team member responses in relation to the overall group rating. Differences are considered and discussed, and ultimately agreement is reached on a set of priorities. This process of consensus-building is also used to build a sense of "ownership" among team members in relation to each of the identified priorities.

❑ For the purposes of the 2008-2009 implementation, we ask that each site select a minimum of three indicators that they will work on this year.

❑ For the purposes of this year's evaluation of the process and the framework, please keep a record of what worked and what did not work for the team as the group progresses through the self-assessment and priority setting tools.

SCHEDULE AND HOLD THIRD MEETING

At the Third Meeting: Begin with a Review of Progress

❑ Review results of the steps completed during the first meeting.
❑ If consensus on priorities was reached, prepare a list of the three indicators that were chosen for the team to work on this year.
❑ Review the agenda and process that will be used to complete the *Reintegration Framework Action Planning Tool*.

Complete the Action Planning Tool

❑ After completing the *Reintegration Framework Priority Setting Tool*, the Interagency Strategic Planning Team will have selected a minimum of three priority areas to work on during 2008-2009. Write each of the selected priority indicators under Priority Issue #1, Priority Issue #2, and Priority Issue #3 in the *Action Planning Tool*.

❑ Next, develop up to three goals for each of the priority issues. Questions to consider in the process of developing goals include: (1) What are the desired outcomes, in measurable terms? (2) What will be different after your plan is completed?

❑ For each priority issue and goal, identify and record in the table:
  ▪ Specific action steps
  ▪ The lead agency
  ▪ Timelines or completion date
  ▪ Critical partners and resources
  ▪ Expected outcomes.

❑ The team may need to brainstorm a number of possible action steps before determining the ones the group feels are most appropriate.

❑ More questions to consider:
  ▪ What observable tasks will your team take to achieve your overall strategy?
  ▪ Who will be responsible for each step? By what date will each task be completed?
  ▪ How will your team evaluate your strategic action plan activities to determine if they were successful?
  ▪ Describe the process your team will use to measure your anticipated outcomes.

- How will your team respond to the outcomes of this project to further improve your practices?
- How will your team support each major action step/strategy (e.g., resources, including fiscal)?

CONTINUE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE *REINTEGRATION FRAMEWORK* PROJECT

❑ Meet with your Interagency Strategic Planning Team throughout the year to discuss challenges and progress as action is taken on the strategic plan.
❑ Participate in the evaluation component of the *Reintegration Framework Project*
- Maintain an on-going record of the strengths and weaknesses of the *Reintegration Framework Strategic Planning Toolkit* identified by your team during the implementation of the project.
- Make recommendations for continuation, changes, and/or additions to the *Reintegration Framework Strategic Planning Toolkit*.
- Prepare for and participate in the site visit with the University of Minnesota evaluation team (may include observations of Interagency Strategic Planning Team meeting and/or interviews with team members).

REINTEGRATION FRAMEWORK: FRAMING AREAS AND INDICATORS

	1.	**INTERAGENCY COLLABORATION**
1.1		Procedures and interagency agreements are established with appropriate agencies.
1.2		Timely transfer of all appropriate youth records occurs between releasing and receiving programs.
1.3		All involved agencies are aware of the youth's needs and of the services that each agency is providing to meet those needs.
1.4		Communication occurs regularly between agencies.
1.5		Resources and technical expertise are shared across systems.
1.6		There is joint responsibility for planning and implementing services.
1.7		Systems are developed and maintained that eliminate duplicated efforts.
1.8		Staff are aware of and familiar with all state, county, local, and private programs that receive or send youth to/from jail, detention centers, or other separate site facilities.
1.9		Ongoing training and staff development are planned and conducted.
1.10		Special funds are earmarked for transition and support services.
	2.	**Team Planning**
2.1		A planning team is established, including the youth, parents, and representatives from all agencies involved in the youth's program, to design a reintegration plan.
2.2		One of the members of the planning team is identified as the youth's key contact or advocate for the entire reintegration process.
2.3		A decision-making protocol for the team is established in the pre-transition phase.
2.4		The youth is an active participant in planning process.
2.5		Family and/or guardians are informed of and involved in the planning process.

	3. Education
3.1	Youth has an education plan (e.g., IEP) with well-established academic, behavioral, and vocational goals and objectives.
3.2	Reintegration/transition is addressed in youth's education plan.
3.3	Staff to staff (case manager to school counselor, teacher to teacher, etc.) contacts are made between receiving school and sending school staff.
3.4	Youth's receiving school is notified and involved in the reintegration process.
3.5	A plan is in place for school re-entry that includes sending and receiving schools' responsibilities.
3.6	Aftercare conditions are communicated to receiving school and agreements are made regarding monitoring prior to reintegration.
3.7	Paperwork arrives at the new site ahead of youth or follows them in a timely fashion.
3.8	A pre-release visit and admissions interview is scheduled with receiving school and youth shares his/her transition/reintegration plan with admissions interviewer.
3.9	Student, parents, and receiving school staff sign a behavior contract or reintegration plan.
3.10	Receiving school supports reintegration by matching curriculum and teacher assignment to meet youth's needs (as outlined in student's IEP).
	4. Supporting Life Skills
4.1	Youth receives social and independent living skill training.
4.2	Youth receives vocational assessment, counseling, and training.
4.3	Youth receives training for parenthood, if appropriate.
4.4	Youth receives alcohol and drug abuse counseling, if appropriate.
4.5	Youth receives on-going support for mental health needs (e.g., therapy and follow-up), if appropriate.
4.6	Youth has access to a resource center that contains a variety of materials related to transition and support services.

	5. Continuity During and Post Transition
5.1	Youth meets with receiving school counselor within first two weeks of placement.
5.2	Youth meets with receiving school counselor on a regular basis.
5.3	Youth has on-going contact with staff from previous facility for at least 6 months.
5.4	Staff to staff (case manager to school counselor, teacher to teacher, etc.) contacts are continued between receiving school and sending school staff for 6 months after reintegration.
5.5	Involved agencies maintain interagency communication once youth have been integrated into school, work, and community.
5.6	Youth, parents, and service providers receive information about continuum of services and care.
5.7	Follow-up occurs at the program level to verify that agreed upon transition processes occurred for the student.
5.8	Systems are in place for periodic evaluation of transition and reintegration processes.

Reintegration Framework: Self-Assessment Tool

Purpose

The *Reintegration Framework* is designed to facilitate communication and sharing within and among interagency partners, based upon a common understanding of what constitutes best practice in transition and reintegration. Use this self-assessment tool to:

- better understand current operations;
- identify areas of strength, weakness, and opportunity;
- promote planning and continuous improvement;
- begin action for improving systems; and
- assess progress.

By completing this self-assessment tool, users will achieve a shared frame of reference from which to build commitment and focus for setting priorities and improving transition/reintegration systems. The information is for planning purposes only and *will not be used by any state program or agency to determine compliance.*

Directions

The *Reintegration Framework* asks interagency strategic planning team partners to identify the extent to which each indicator is evident within their site or local community. Using a four-point rating scale (Always Evident, Usually Evident, Seldom Evident, Not Evident), respondents can assess the status of each indicator (3 = Always Evident, 2 = Usually Evident, 1 = Seldom Evident, and 0 = Not Evident). In a group setting, respondents then communicate their individual ratings to each other and come to agreement on a single rating for each indicator. This rating should be recorded in the column labeled *Group Self-Assessment Rating* and should be a rating of 3, 2, 1, or 0. Space for comments is provided at the bottom of the first page of each framing area.

As much as possible, each site should record the evidence they used to determine whether an indicator was always evident, usually evident, seldom evident, or not evident. Forms will be provided for teams to record this information.

After completing the self-assessment tool, and recording the group self-assessment rating for each indicator, use the *Priority Setting* worksheet to rate the *Importance* of each indicator. Then, considering the relative *Importance* of each indicator in conjunction with its *Group Self-Assessment Rating*, determine the *Priority for Improvement* for each indicator. Your strategic planning team can then use this information for both short-term and long-term planning.

REINTEGRATION FRAMEWORK: SELF-ASSESSMENT TOOL

	1. Interagency Collaboration				
INDICATOR	ALWAYS EVIDENT = 3	USUALLY EVIDENT = 2	SELDOM EVIDENT = 1	NOT EVIDENT = 0	GROUP SELF-ASSESSMENT RATING
1.1 Procedures and interagency agreements are established with appropriate agencies.					
1.2 Timely transfer of all appropriate youth records occurs between releasing and receiving programs.					
1.3 All involved agencies are aware of the youth's needs and of the services that each agency is providing to meet those needs.					
1.4 Communication occurs regularly between agencies.					
1.5 Resources and technical expertise are shared across systems.					
1.6 There is joint responsibility for planning and implementing services.					
1.7 Systems are developed and maintained that eliminate duplicated efforts.					
1.8 Staff are aware of and familiar with all state, county, local, and private programs that receive or send youth to/from jail, detention centers, or other separate site facilities.					
1.9 Ongoing training and staff development are planned and conducted.					
1.10 Special funds are earmarked for transition and support services.					
Comments:					

REINTEGRATION FRAMEWORK: SELF-ASSESSMENT TOOL

					2. Team Planning
INDICATOR	ALWAYS EVIDENT = 3	USUALLY EVIDENT = 2	SELDOM EVIDENT = 1	NOT EVIDENT = 0	GROUP SELF-ASSESSMENT RATING
2.1 A planning team is established, including the youth, parents, and representatives from all agencies involved in the youth's program, to design a reintegration plan.					
2.2 One of the members of the planning team is identified as the youth's key contact or advocate for the entire reintegration process.					
2.3 A decision-making protocol for the team is established in the pre-transition phase.					
2.4 The youth is an active participant in planning process.					
2.5 Family and/or guardians are informed of and involved in the planning process.					
Comments:					

REINTEGRATION FRAMEWORK: SELF-ASSESSMENT TOOL

INDICATOR	ALWAYS EVIDENT = 3	USUALLY EVIDENT = 2	SELDOM EVIDENT = 1	NOT EVIDENT = 0	GROUP SELF-ASSESSMENT RATING
3.1 Youth has an education plan (e.g., IEP) with well-established academic, behavioral, and vocational goals and objectives.					
3.2 Reintegration/transition is addressed in youth's education plan.					
3.3 Staff to staff (case manager to school counselor, teacher to teacher, etc.) contacts are made between receiving school and sending school staff.					
3.4 Youth's receiving school is notified and involved in the reintegration process.					
3.5 A plan is in place for school re-entry that includes sending and receiving schools' responsibilities.					
3.6 Aftercare conditions are communicated to receiving school and agreements are made regarding monitoring prior to reintegration.					
3.7 Paperwork arrives at the new site ahead of youth or follows them in a timely fashion.					
3.8 A pre-release visit and admissions interview is scheduled with receiving school and youth shares his/her transition/reintegration plan with admissions interviewer.					
3.9 Student, parents, and receiving school staff sign a behavior contract or reintegration plan.					
3.10 Receiving school supports reintegration by matching curriculum and teacher assignment to meet youth's needs (as outlined in student's IEP).					

3. Education

Comments:

REINTEGRATION FRAMEWORK: SELF-ASSESSMENT TOOL

					4. Supporting Life Skills
INDICATOR	ALWAYS EVIDENT = 3	USUALLY EVIDENT = 2	SELDOM EVIDENT = 1	NOT EVIDENT = 0	GROUP SELF-ASSESSMENT RATING
4.1 Youth receives social and independent living skill training.					
4.2 Youth receives vocational assessment, counseling, and training.					
4.3 Youth receives training for parenthood, if appropriate.					
4.4 Youth receives alcohol and drug abuse counseling, if appropriate.					
4.5 Youth receives on-going support for mental health needs (e.g., therapy and follow-up), if appropriate.					
4.6 Youth has access to a resource center that contains a variety of materials related to transition and support services.					
Comments:					

REINTEGRATION FRAMEWORK: SELF-ASSESSMENT TOOL

	5. Continuity During and Post Transition				
INDICATOR	ALWAYS EVIDENT = 3	USUALLY EVIDENT = 2	SELDOM EVIDENT = 1	NOT EVIDENT = 0	GROUP SELF-ASSESSMENT RATING
5.1 Youth meets with receiving school counselor within first two weeks of placement.					
5.2 Youth meets with receiving school counselor on a regular basis.					
5.3 Youth has on-going contact with staff from previous facility for at least 6 months.					
5.4 Staff to staff (case manager to school counselor, teacher to teacher, etc.) contacts are continued between receiving school and sending school staff for 6 months after reintegration.					
5.5 Involved agencies maintain interagency communication once youth have been integrated into school, work, and community.					
5.6 Youth, parents, and service providers receive information about continuum of services and care.					
5.7 Follow-up occurs at the program level to verify that agreed upon transition processes occurred for the student.					
5.8 Systems are in place for periodic evaluation of transition and reintegration processes.					
Comments:					

Reintegration Framework: Priority Setting Tool

Purpose
The *Reintegration Framework* is designed to assist interagency partners in identifying primary areas for improvement and in ranking their order of importance. Each indicator is rated high, mid, or low importance in conjunction with its *Group Self-Assessment Rating* to determine its *Priority for Improvement.* Your strategic planning team can then use this information for both short-term and long-term planning.

Directions
Using the *Reintegration Framework Priority Setting Tool,* the interagency strategic planning team should first identify the extent to which each indicator is important by rating each indicator high, mid, or low importance. Respondents then rate the priority for improvement based on the level of importance and the *Group Self-Assessment Rating*. For example, an indicator that receives a high level of importance rating and a low self-assessment score may warrant a high level of priority for improvement rating.

Individual and team importance and priority for improvement ratings are recorded. The next step is to reach consensus on the highest priorities identified. This step often requires a facilitated discussion to examine the range and variation of individual team member responses in relation to the overall group rating. Differences are considered and discussed, and ultimately agreement is reached on a set of priorities. This process of consensus-building is also used to build a sense of "ownership" among team members in relation to each of the identified priorities. For the purposes of the 2007-2008 implementation, we ask that each site select a minimum of three indicators that they will work on this year.

FRAMING AREAS AND INDICATORS	Importance			Group Self-Assessment Rating	Priority for Improvement		
	High	Mid	Low		High	Mid	Low
1. Interagency Collaboration							
1.1 • Procedures and interagency agreements are established with appropriate agencies.							
1.2 • Timely transfer of all appropriate youth records occurs between releasing and receiving programs.							
1.3 • All involved agencies are aware of the youth's needs and of the services that each agency is providing to meet those needs.							
1.4 • Communication occurs regularly between agencies.							
1.5 • Resources and technical expertise are shared across systems.							
1.6 • There is joint responsibility for planning and implementing services.							
1.7 • Systems are developed and maintained that eliminate duplicated efforts.							
1.8 • Staff are aware of and familiar with all state, county, local, and private programs that receive or send youth to/from jail, detention centers, or other separate site facilities.							
1.9 • Ongoing training and staff development are planned and conducted.							
1.10 • Special funds are earmarked for transition and support services.							

Reintegration Framework Project: Minnesota Department of Education and
The Evaluation Group at the Institute on Community Integration, University of Minnesota

19

FRAMING AREAS AND INDICATORS	Importance			Group Self-Assessment Rating	Priority for Improvement		
	High	Mid	Low		High	Mid	Low
2. Team Planning							
2.1 • A planning team is established, including the youth, parents, and representatives from all agencies involved in the youth's program, to design a reintegration plan.							
2.2 • One of the members of the planning team is identified as the youth's key contact or advocate for the entire reintegration process.							
2.3 • A decision-making protocol for the team is established in the pre-transition phase.							
2.4 • The youth is an active participant in planning process.							
2.5 • Family and/or guardians are informed of and involved in the planning process.							

Reintegration Framework Project: Minnesota Department of Education and
The Evaluation Group at the Institute on Community Integration, University of Minnesota

20

FRAMING AREAS AND INDICATORS	Importance			Group Self-Assessment Rating	Priority for Improvement		
	High	Mid	Low		High	Mid	Low
3. Education							
3.1 • Youth has an education plan (e.g., IEP) with well-established academic, behavioral, and vocational goals and objectives.							
3.2 • Reintegration/transition is addressed in youth's education plan.							
3.3 • Staff to staff (case manager to school counselor, teacher to teacher, etc.) contacts are made between receiving school and sending school staff.							
3.4 • Youth's receiving school is notified and involved in the reintegration process.							
3.5 • A plan is in place for school re-entry that includes sending and receiving schools' responsibilities.							
3.6 • Aftercare conditions are communicated to receiving school and agreements are made regarding monitoring prior to reintegration.							
3.7 • Paperwork arrives at the new site ahead of youth or follows them in a timely fashion.							
3.8 • A pre-release visit and admissions interview is scheduled with receiving school and youth shares his/her transition/reintegration plan with admissions interviewer.							
3.9 • Student, parents, and receiving school staff sign a behavior contract or reintegration plan.							
3.10 • Receiving school supports reintegration by matching curriculum and teacher assignment to meet youth's needs (as outlined in student's IEP).							

Reintegration Framework Project: Minnesota Department of Education and
The Evaluation Group at the Institute on Community Integration, University of Minnesota

21

FRAMING AREAS AND INDICATORS	Importance			Group Self-Assessment Rating	Priority for Improvement		
	High	Mid	Low		High	Mid	Low
4. Supporting Life Skills							
4.1 • Youth receives social and independent living skill training.							
4.2 • Youth receives vocational assessment, counseling, and training.							
4.3 • Youth receives training for parenthood, if appropriate.							
4.4 • Youth receives alcohol and drug abuse counseling, if appropriate.							
4.5 • Youth receives on-going support for mental health needs (e.g., therapy and follow-up), if appropriate.							
4.6 • Youth has access to a resource center that contains a variety of materials related to transition and support services.							

Reintegration Framework Project: Minnesota Department of Education and
The Evaluation Group at the Institute on Community Integration, University of Minnesota

22

FRAMING AREAS AND INDICATORS	Importance			Group Self-Assessment Rating	Priority for Improvement		
	High	Mid	Low		High	Mid	Low
5. Continuity During and Post Transition							
5.1 • Youth meets with receiving school counselor within first two weeks of placement.							
5.2 • Youth meets with receiving school counselor on a regular basis.							
5.3 • Youth has on-going contact with staff from previous facility for at least 6 months.							
5.4 • Staff to staff (case manager to school counselor, teacher to teacher, etc.) contacts are continued between receiving school and sending school staff for 6 months after reintegration.							
5.5 • Involved agencies maintain interagency communication once youth have been integrated into school, work, and community.							
5.6 • Youth, parents, and service providers receive information about continuum of services and care.							
5.7 • Follow-up occurs at the program level to verify that agreed upon transition processes occurred for the student.							
5.8 • Systems are in place for periodic evaluation of transition and reintegration processes.							

Reintegration Framework Project: Minnesota Department of Education and
The Evaluation Group at the Institute on Community Integration, University of Minnesota

23

Strategic Work Questions

❖ What is the desired outcome of your strategic action plan, in measurable terms?

❖ What will be different after your strategic action plan is completed?

❖ Summarize in one sentence the overall strategy your team will take to obtain this outcome. What will you do, overall?

❖ What observable tasks will your team take to achieve your overall strategy? Who will be responsible for each step? By what date will each task be completed?

❖ How will your team support each goal?

❖ List at least one resource for each goal that requires funding.

❖ How will your team evaluate your strategic action plan activities to determine if they were successful?

❖ Describe the process your team will use to measure your anticipated outcome.

❖ How will your team respond to the outcomes of this project to further improve your practices?

❖ Describe your reflective process.

❖ Celebrating success is a good way to get support for future endeavors. How will your site and its communities know of your collaborative efforts?

Reintegration Framework: Action Planning Tool

Purpose
The next step is the development of a written plan detailing the actions that interagency teams will take to bring about desired improvements in identified priority areas. The action planning process engages interagency strategic planning team members in a process of identifying, for each priority, specific program improvement steps and strategies, individuals and agencies responsible, resources needed, interventions to support needed improvements, timelines for completion, and anticipated outcomes. The planning process relies on the basic structure of strategic planning (Bryson, 1988, 2004; David & Davidson, 1991). The most important aspect of the action planning process is the delineation of the specific outcomes, indicators, and benchmarks to be achieved as improvement strategies are implemented.

Directions
After completing the *Reintegration Framework Priority Setting Tool*, the interagency strategic planning team will have selected a minimum of **three** priority areas. Write each of the selected priority indicators under Priority Issue #1, Priority Issue #2, and Priority Issue #3. Next, develop up to three goals for each of the priority issues. For each priority issue and goal, identify action steps, the lead agency, timelines, the critical partners, and expected outcomes and record in the table below.

REINTEGRATION FRAMEWORK: ACTION PLANNING TOOL

Priority Issue #1:

Action Step	Lead Agency	Date To be Done By	Partners & Resources	Expected Outcomes
Goal #1:				
1.				
2.				
3.				
Goal #2:				
1.				
2.				
3.				
Goal #3:				
1.				
2.				
3.				

REINTEGRATION FRAMEWORK: ACTION PLANNING TOOL

Priority Issue #2:

Action Step	Lead Agency	Date To Be Done By	Partners & Resources	Expected Outcomes
Goal #1:				
1.				
2.				
3.				
Goal #2:				
1.				
2.				
3.				
Goal #3:				
1.				
2.				
3.				

REINTEGRATION FRAMEWORK: ACTION PLANNING TOOL

Priority Issue #3:

Action Step	Lead Agency	Date To Be Done By	Partners & Resources	Expected Outcomes
Goal #1:				
1.				
2.				
3.				
Goal #2:				
1.				
2.				
3.				
Goal #3:				
1.				
2.				
3.				

Reintegration Framework Project: Minnesota Department of Education and
The Evaluation Group at the Institute on Community Integration, University of Minnesota

28