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Matching Services...
Overview of JJSIP

• Grant sponsored by Georgetown University: Center for Juvenile Justice Reform

• 4 sites chosen out of over 150 applications:
  • Florida
    • Initial pilot site: Pinellas County
  • Arizona
  • Pennsylvania
  • Connecticut
JJSIP Components

• Comprehensive Strategy
• Evaluation [*Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol (SPEP)*]
Research Basis

• Key features of juvenile offender careers
• We understand how offender careers develop
• Early intervention is a top priority for maximum system effectiveness
• 5 Principles of Effective Intervention
• Structured Decision Making Tools
Serious, Violent, Chronic Youth

**SERIOUS** = 55%  
**VIOLENT** = 29%  
**CHRONIC** = 15%

SVC = 8.9%

**NOT SVC** = 44%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Serious</th>
<th>Violent</th>
<th>Chronic</th>
<th>SVC</th>
<th>Not S, V, or C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2007-08</td>
<td>84,586</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2008-09</td>
<td>80,540</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2009-10</td>
<td>72,713</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2010-11</td>
<td>65,858</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2011-12</td>
<td>59,920</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>363,617</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANOVA Tests  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2007-08</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2008-09</td>
<td>30.34</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2009-10</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2010-11</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75.22</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: FY=fiscal year; SVC= Serious, Violent, and Chronic; Not S, V, or C are youth that do not meet any of the three categories; For ANOVA, F-statistic reported with p-value in parenthesis.
SVC Youth: Why does it Matter?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Youth</th>
<th>Not S, V, or C</th>
<th>Not SVC</th>
<th>SVC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recidivism Rates</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang Association</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Over 50% of SVC youth were 12 or under at age of first referral

- Note: Data from the FY 09-10 sample.
A Larger Percentage of Very Young Offenders Have SVC Careers

First Offense 13 or Over

- Violent = 22%
- Serious = 45%
- SVC = 4%
- Chronic = 8%

245,726 “Aged-out” Juvenile Offenders

First Offense 12 or Under

- Violent = 42%
- Serious = 66%
- SVC = 21%
- Chronic = 32%

51,928 “Aged-out” Juvenile Offenders

Florida DJJ Data: 297,654 Juvenile Offenders Who Have Turned 18
The First JJSIP Component

THE COMPREHENSIVE STRATEGY
Why a Comprehensive Strategy?

• Unbalanced emphasis on “deep end” graduated sanctions v. prevention and early intervention
• Overreliance on detention and residential placement
• Poor targeting of SVC youth
• Poor matching of youth to appropriate services and levels of supervision
• Use of ineffective programs
• Poor program planning
What is a Comprehensive Strategy?

- A **continuum** of services from universal prevention through residential and aftercare
- Ensures the appropriate **allocation of resources** to each level of services along the continuum
- Ensures the matching of youth to the level of services based on **assessed** risk and needs (C-PACT, R-PACT, Prevention PACT)
- Promotes prevention: Targets **at-risk youth**; prevents youth from becoming delinquent by focusing prevention programs on at-risk youth
- Incorporates Interventions and Graduated Sanctions: Target **delinquent youth**; Improve the juvenile justice system’s response to delinquent offenders within a continuum of treatment and service options and a system of graduated sanctions
**Prevention**

*Target Population: At-Risk Youth*

Preventing youth from becoming delinquent by focusing prevention programs on at-risk youth

**Graduated Sanctions**

*Target Population: Delinquent Youth*

Improving the juvenile justice system response to delinquent offenders through a system of graduated sanctions and a continuum of treatment alternatives
A Graduated Sanctions Model

Diversion
Teen Court
Probation
Intensive PS
Day Treatment
Redirection
C/R Day Treatment
Redirection
Intensive PS
Probation

Increasing Sanctions
Decreasing Sanctions
The Comprehensive Strategy

- Research-Based
- Data Driven
- Service Matching
- Outcome-Focused Framework
Two-Tiered Approach

- Prevent youth from becoming delinquent:
  - Focusing prevention programs on at-risk youth
- Improve the response to offenders through a system of graduated sanctions

Both goals can accomplished with a “seamless” continuum of prevention, early intervention, and treatment options linked with graduated sanctions
# 5 Principles of Effective Intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Risk:</td>
<td>Target high-risk offenders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need:</td>
<td>Treat risk factors associated with offending behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment:</td>
<td>Employ evidence-based and research-proven treatment approaches and interventions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsivity:</td>
<td>Tailor treatments to meet special needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity:</td>
<td>Monitor implementation quality and treatment fidelity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Risk Principle

1. Treating high-risk youth gives the greatest reduction in re-offending behavior.


3. Matching levels of treatment services—intensity and duration—to the risk level of the offender.

4. Utilize intensive community-based treatment for lower-risk, high-needs youth.
## Targeting High-Risk Offenders

(Andrews & Bonta, 2003)

### Risk Level and Treatment Recidivism Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Risk Level</th>
<th>Level of Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Donnell et al. (1971)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baird et al. (1979)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews &amp; Kiessling</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1980)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonta et al. (2000)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note: Data from 2012 Comprehensive Accountability Report (CAR) final files
Recidivism rate for IDDS significantly lower than all other placement types for the low risk sample. Diversion and IDDS significantly lower than Probation Supervision. Probation Supervision, CBIS, Probation Enhancement rates statistically equivalent. Probation, CBIS, and Probation Enhancement rates significantly lower than Day Treatment, Redirection, Residential, and PCP. Day Treatment, Redirection, Residential, and PCP recidivism rates are statistically equivalent.
Recidivism Rate for Low Risk Youth by "Needs" Level by Placement Type

Note: Data from 2012 Comprehensive Accountability Report (CAR) final files
"High Needs" defined as youth greater than 1 standard deviation above the mean on the Social History Score subcomponent of the PACT. Statistically significant differences found in the recidivism rates for low risk "high needs" youth versus youth not identified as such for the following Placement Types: Diversion, IDDS, Probation Supervision, with low risk "high needs" youth having significantly higher recidivism rates. Differences in recidivism rates for Probation Enhancement, Day Treatment, Redirection, Residential, and Post Commitment Probation were not significant.
Lipsey’s 2009 Meta-analysis

- “Interventions applied to high-risk delinquents...produced larger recidivism reductions than when those interventions were applied to low-risk delinquents” (p.23)

- “There was no indication that there were juveniles whose risk level was so high that they did not respond to effective interventions” (p.23)
Common Risk Factors Predict Delinquency (The Big Eight)

1. Antisocial Attitudes
2. Antisocial Peers
3. Antisocial Personality Patterns (impulsivity, low self-control, risk taking)
4. History of Antisocial Behavior
5. Problems at School/work
6. Problematic Family Circumstances
7. Problematic Leisure Activities/use of free time
8. Substance Abuse
Need Principle: Why Dynamic Priority Domains?

- Research shows a 38% reduction in recidivism when case plans contained interventions matched to assessed criminogenic needs for high risk youth. (Luong, D., & Wormith, J.S. (2011).

- The absence of interventions to address a domain that was ranked medium risk or higher was associated with an 82% increase in likelihood of recidivism. (Luong, D., & Wormith, J.S. (2011).
Responsivity Factors

Responsivity: Factors within individuals or the environment that do not predict re-offending, but constitute ‘roadblocks’ to treatment.

The more you help youths drive down criminogenic needs, the better are their chances of quitting crime.

Source: Justice System Assessment & Training http://www.j-sat.com
Stages of Change Model

Possible Permanent Exit

Prochaska & DiClemente (1986)

Protective Factors:

Factors that decrease the effects of risk factors and increase the likelihood of desistance.
EBP Mantra

• The right service
• For the right kid
• At the right time
• In the right dosage
The Second JJSIP Component

STANDARDIZED PROGRAM EVALUATION PROTOCOL (SPEP)
Evidence-Based Practices

• Approaches to determine if a program is “evidence-based”
  • Evaluate existing program
  • Model/Brand name program
  • Meta-analysis/synthesis of research on effective programs
What is the SPEP?

- Evaluation tool
- Identifies shortcomings in programs or services
- Determines the strength of programs and services in relation to existing research
- Determines where programs or services fall in terms of effectiveness
SPEP Categories

• **Service Type**: “Therapeutic” programs, with some types more effective than others

• **Service Quality**: Treatment protocol; monitoring and staff training

• **Service Quantity/Dosage**: Duration, intensity, and total number of contact hours

• **Juvenile Characteristics**: Risk to re-offend level of youth served
Why Therapeutic Program Types?

- Discipline
- Deterrence
- Surveillance
- Restorative
- Skill building
- Counseling
- Multiple services

% Recidivism Reduction from .50 Baseline
Further Sorting by Intervention Type within, e.g., Counseling Approaches

![Bar Chart: % Recidivism Reduction from .50 Baseline]

- Individual
- Mentoring
- Family
- Family crisis
- Group
- Peer
- Mixed
- Mixed w/referrals
Further Sorting by Intervention Type within, e.g., Skill-building Approaches

- Behavioral
- Cognitive-behavioral
- Social skills
- Challenge
- Academic
- Job related

% Recidivism Reduction from .50 Baseline
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Meta-Analysis: Dosage

- **Group 5 Service (Score=30)**
  - **Cognitive-Behavioral Therapy**
    - Target Weeks=15; Target Hours=45
    - Qualifying Supplemental Services: None (automatic 5 points added to score)

- **Group 4 Service (Score=25)**
  - **Group Counseling**
    - Target Weeks=24; Target Hours=40
    - Qualifying Supplemental Services: None (automatic 5 points added to score)
  - **Mentoring**
    - Target Weeks=26; Target Hours=78
    - Qualifying Supplemental Services: Behavioral Contracting/Management
  - **Behavioral Contracting; Contingency Management**
    - Target Weeks=24; Target Hours=72
    - Qualifying Supplemental Services: Mentoring, Mixed Counseling (individual, group, family, and/or vocational), Remedial Academic Program
Dosage (cont.)

• **Group 3 Service (Score=15)**
  • Family Counseling
    • Target Weeks=20; Target Hours=30
    • Qualifying Supplemental Services: None (automatic 5 points added to score)
  • Family Crisis Counseling
    • Target Weeks=4; Target Hours=8
    • Qualifying Supplemental Services: None (automatic 5 points added to score)
  • Mixed Counseling
    • Target Weeks=25; Target Hours=25
    • Qualifying Supplemental Services: Behavioral Contracting/Management
  • Social Skills Training
    • Target Weeks=16; Target Hours=24
    • Qualifying Supplemental Services: None (automatic 5 points added to score)
  • Challenge Programs
    • Target Weeks=4; Target Hours=60
    • Qualifying Supplemental Services: Group Counseling
  • Mediation
    • Target Weeks=4; Target Hours=8
    • Qualifying Supplemental Services: Restitution/Community Service
Dosage (cont. 2)

• **Group 2 Service (Score=10)**
  • Restitution; Community Service
    • Target Weeks=12; Target Hours=60
    • Qualifying Supplemental Services: None (automatic 5 points added to score)
  • Remedial Academic Program
    • Target Weeks=26; Target Hours=100
    • Qualifying Supplemental Services: Job-Related Services (work experience, job preparation, and/or job training)

• **Group 1 Service (Score=5)**
  • Individual Counseling
    • Target Weeks=25; Target Hours=30
    • Qualifying Supplemental Services: None (automatic 5 points added to score)
  • Job-Related Training
    • Vocational Counseling
      • Target Weeks=20; Target Hours=40
      • Qualifying Supplemental Services: Remedial Academic Services
    • Job Training
      • Target Weeks=25; Target Hours=400
      • Qualifying Supplemental Services: Remedial Academic Services
    • Work Experience
      • Target Weeks=26; Target Hours=520
      • Qualifying Supplemental Services: Remedial Academic Services
Bridging the Gap Between Research and Practice

STRUCTURED DECISION MAKING
Disposition Recommendation Matrix

- Is a structured decision making tool that assists with matching youth to the appropriate level of service/supervision
- Is based on a matrix of risk to reoffend (PACT) and the presenting offense
- Consists of graduated sanctions – The intensity of services increases as the risk level and offense severity increases
Key Points of the Disposition Matrix

• Low-risk offenders remain in the community with minimal supervision
• Moderate-risk offenders typically placed in more structured community programs, with intensive probation supervision for higher risk youth
• Residential placement reserved for the highest risk offenders after community-based alternatives have been exhausted
# Florida Department of Juvenile Justice Disposition Recommendation Matrix

(Staff must always begin with the least restrictive setting within a particular disposition category. See SDM guidelines)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Serious Presenting Offense</th>
<th>PACT Risk Level to Re-Offend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low-Risk to Re-offend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st TIME MISDEMEANOR(^1)</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor(^2)</td>
<td>Level 2 or 3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious(^3)</td>
<td>Level 2 or 3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent(^4)</td>
<td>Level 2 or 3a-b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. First time misdemeanor offenders with no history of arrest or participation in alternatives to arrest. Under Section 985.12, Florida Statutes, all first time misdemeanants are eligible for civil citation. Youth deemed ineligible for civil citation (based on community standards) should be reviewed under the "Misdemeanor" category based on their PACT Risk Level to Reoffend.

2. All misdemeanor offenses.

3. Felony offenses that do not include violence.

4. Violent felony offenses (does not include misdemeanor assault/battery, which is captured under "minor").

**Level 1** - Alternatives to Arrest
- Level 2 - Diversion & Non-DJJ Probation
  - Level 3 - Community Supervision
    - (3a) - Probation supervision
  - Level 4 - Non Secure Residential Commitment (Low & Moderate-Risk Programs)
  - Level 5 - Secure Residential Commitment (High & Maximum-Risk Programs)
    - (3b) - Probation enhancement services (ART, LifeSkills, etc.)
    - (3c) - Day Treatment, MST, FFT
Questions about the data should be directed to Mark Russell by e-mail at Mark.Russell@djj.state.fl.us.
For more information visit http://www.djj.state.fl.us/
**Disposition Matrix Report**

**Florida Department of Juvenile Justice**

*Our Children, Our Future*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Circuit</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Disposition Multiple Values</th>
<th>PACT Risk Level</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Above Guidelines**
- **Appropriate Placement**
- **Optimum Placement**
- **Below Guidelines**

**Placements by Month April 2013 - March 2014**

- **Optimum Placement**
  - APR: 2,065
  - MAY: 2,585
  - JUN: 2,272
  - JUL: 2,299
  - AUG: 2,112
  - SEP: 1,923
  - OCT: 2,244
  - NOV: 1,853
  - DEC: 1,842
  - JAN: 2,171
  - FEB: 1,971
  - MAR: 2,002

- **% difference from previous month**
- **Appropriate Placement**
  - APR: 82%
  - MAY: 81%
  - JUN: 80%
  - JUL: 80%
  - AUG: 81%
  - SEP: 81%
  - OCT: 81%
  - NOV: 82%
  - DEC: 83%
  - JAN: 80%
  - FEB: 79%
  - MAR: 66%

- **Above Guidelines**
  - APR: 131
  - MAY: 135
  - JUN: 119
  - JUL: 123
  - AUG: 99
  - SEP: 73
  - OCT: 94
  - NOV: 65
  - DEC: 76
  - JAN: 91
  - FEB: 85
  - MAR: 86

- **Below Guidelines**
  - APR: 26
  - MAY: 22
  - JUN: 32
  - JUL: 32
  - AUG: 24
  - SEP: 20
  - OCT: 30
  - NOV: 31
  - DEC: 17
  - JAN: 24
  - FEB: 24
  - MAR: 23

**Total**
- 3,255
- 3,151
- 2,789
- 2,873
- 2,632
- 2,362
- 2,811
- 2,207
- 2,239
- 2,630
- 2,456
- 2,522

**Questions about the data should be directed to Mark Russell by e-mail at Mark.Russell@djj.state.fl.us.**

**For more information visit** [http://www.djj.state.fl.us/](http://www.djj.state.fl.us/)
Disposition Matrix Validation

- 38,117 youth released in FY10-11.
- Holds true for males, females, across race/ethnicity, and for all risk levels of youth.
Continuum Mapping

• Identify the available services within each county
• Map the identified available services according to service category within each county
• Identify the target population for each categorized service according to levels of the Disposition Recommendation Matrix
### County Service Mapping

#### Continuum of Services - At a Glance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comprehensive Strategy</th>
<th>Prevention</th>
<th>Graduated Sanctions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target Populations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Services &amp; Structures Categories</th>
<th>Available Program/Services</th>
<th>All Youth</th>
<th>Youth at Greatest Risk</th>
<th>Alternatives to Arrest</th>
<th>Diversion</th>
<th>Probation Supervision</th>
<th>Non-Secure Residential</th>
<th>Secure Commitment</th>
<th>Parole /Aftercare</th>
<th>Capacity or number of slots</th>
<th>Waiting list?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skill Building/Structured Activities</td>
<td>Embassy Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ginter Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial Academic Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restorative Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Behavioral Interventions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
January-December 2013 there were 79 low risk to re-offend youth committed statewide. This is a 76% decrease from the same time period in 2011 and a 45% decrease from the same time period in 2012.
There were 222 moderate risk to re-offend youth committed statewide from January-December 2013. This is a 61% reduction from 2011 and a 32% reduction from 2012.
Delinquency Profile 2012 – 2013

Offenses - Arrests Received
Statewide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Felonies</td>
<td>41,108</td>
<td>35,801</td>
<td>31,801</td>
<td>20,350</td>
<td>25,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misdemeanors</td>
<td>67,817</td>
<td>59,349</td>
<td>53,547</td>
<td>45,280</td>
<td>39,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Offenses</td>
<td>27,386</td>
<td>24,798</td>
<td>22,969</td>
<td>20,565</td>
<td>17,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Offenses</td>
<td>130,311</td>
<td>119,948</td>
<td>108,407</td>
<td>95,175</td>
<td>83,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This report was compiled using data from the Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS). For more information visit [http://www.dj.state.fl.us](http://www.dj.state.fl.us)
Implications

• Most youth enter the system with minor offenses and low recidivism risk. Few are on pathways to serious, violent, or chronic offending.

• Risk assessment instruments (PACT) measure risk accurately enough to guide the allocation of resources.

• Needs assessment (PACT Full) identify criminogenic needs well enough to guide selection of appropriate services.

• To be effective, evidence-based services should address priority criminogenic needs.

• Matching of youth to appropriate levels of service targeted to prioritized needs is critical.
Next Steps

• Implementation of Dispositional Matrix
• Mapping Continuum of Services
• Bringing It All Together
References