JUVENILE JUSTICE CONTINUM OF INTERVENTION

Presented By

Chad Connors, JCA Cowlitz County

Barbara Carr, JCA Jefferson County

Dr. Carl McCurley, Director of the Center for Court Research

Dr. Barney Barnoski, Center for Court Research

OVERVIEW STATEMENT

The mission of the juvenile courts is to represent the interests of the community as the agent of intervention in the lives of children in their families; the purpose of intervention is to bring about improved well-being and healthier functioning for children and families. To accomplish the mission, juvenile courts have built a system of objective assessment, professional supervision, and evidence-based, community-located treatment for juveniles and families.

Increasingly, the trend in court operations that serve juveniles and their families is to unify management, treatment, and judicial oversight. Coordinating efforts in court operations result in consistency, increasing investment in services, and evaluation of tools to efficiently manage juveniles and their families in a deliberate manner.

Juvenile courts use empirical evaluation strategies to determine risk and needs of youthful offenders. To maximize the effectiveness of treatment for juveniles, the court staff develops case plans including both services *and* supervision. The case plan is based on the outcome of the risk and protective measurement.

The jurisdiction of juvenile court operations begins with civil case types (dependency – BECCA cases) and extends through juvenile delinquency disposition alternatives. As stated above, with the increasing consistency in managing cases involving families, juvenile courts manage cases in an increasingly holistic manner.

The focus of the juvenile court presentation to the Sentencing Guidelines Commission is to show how juvenile courts manage delinquency caseloads consistently throughout the state. The juvenile courts began the process of standardized evaluation in 1998.

Exhibit D

JUVENILE COURT CONTINUUM

The outline below documents the progression of juvenile court intervention

- DEPENDENCY
- BECCA
  - TRUANCY
  - AT RISK YOUTH
  - CHILD IN NEED OF SERVICES
- DIVERSION
- DEFERRED DISPOSITION
- JUVENILE DELIQUENCY – STANDARD RANGE SUPERVISION
- DISPOSITION ALTERNATIVES TO DIVERT COMMITIBLE YOUTH TO LOCAL SANCTION
  - SSODA
  - CDDA
  - MENTAL HEALTH DISPO ALTERNATIVE
  - SUSPENDED SENTENCE DISPO ALTERNATIVE

CASE MANAGEMENT AND ASSESSMENT PROCESS (CMAP)

CMAP is designed to be a tool for juvenile probation counselors to focus monitoring and rehabilitation on changing risk and protective factors through effective supervision and by utilizing research based programs. The juvenile risk and needs assessment was introduced as a pilot in Washington State in 1998.

CMAP is a standardized evaluation process conducted throughout the period of community supervision. CMAP is not a single event, but a process for managing rehabilitative efforts with juveniles. CMAP enables probation staff to promote positive changes in attitudes and behaviors of a juvenile on community supervision while monitoring court ordered conditions.

The assessment process includes a pre screen, initial assessment and goal setting, reassessment and goal monitoring, and final assessment.

Prescreen assessment is a shortened version of the full assessment. The pre-screen indicates whether the youth is of low, moderate, or high risk. The pre-screen is particularly useful in managing juveniles pre-adjudication and setting conditions of supervision prior to adjudication. If a juvenile is evaluated as low risk, a full assessment is not generally completed.

The *initial assessment* process includes a structured interview by the probation staff, youth, and family. The analysis combines a probation staff's thorough understanding of the assessment concepts with the ability to elicit information. Based on the outcome of the initial assessment, and the identification of risk and protective factors, a service and supervision plan is developed. CMAP measures risk and protective factors in several domains including: criminal history, school, free time, employment, relationships, family, substance use, mental health, attitudes, behavior, aggression, and skills. The case plan, including both supervision and services, is based on goal and task setting and entering the juvenile into intervention services as indicated appropriate based on the juvenile's risk profile.

A *re-assessment* is generally done every 3 months during the period of supervision. The structured interview is not repeated; rather the probation staff reviews the initial CMAP profile, including risk and protective factors. Then the status of goals, tasks, and programming are reviewed with the juvenile. Any changes in risk and protective factors are documented.

The *final assessment* is completed at the end of supervision, regardless if the juvenile completed all the requirements of their disposition or not. All final changes to the assessment information are made and the assessment is closed for that youth's community supervision period.

QUALITY ASSURANCE

The juvenile courts participate in a multi layered system of quality assurance for CMAP and the evidence based treatment programs that are coordinated through the Quality Assurance Committee (QAC). The committee consists of juvenile court representatives, probation staff representatives, juvenile rehabilitation administration (JRA) representatives, and researchers from the Washington State Center for Court Research (WSCCR) and Washington Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP). A full time staff person, working for the courts, coordinates and trains all probation staff in CMAP. That person gets direction from the QAC. Each juvenile court has assigned a Quality Assurance Specialist (QAS). The QAS is responsible for maintaining local quality of CMAP and attend routine booster sessions aimed at managing effective intervention of CMAP.

The 1997 Legislature established the Community Juvenile Accountability Act (CJAA). The goal of the Act is to reduce recidivism and crime rates of juvenile offenders. Under

the Act, local governments can apply for funds to provide a continuum of community based programs. The CJAA committee has leadership from the Washington Association of Juvenile Court Administrators (WAJCA), JRA, WSIPP and WSCCR. The committee determines, based on research, what rehabilitative programs are have empirical proof to reduce recidivism if available to juveniles with pre-specified risk and need profiles. Only those programs approved by the CJAA committee are funded with state - CJAA money.

One additional structured mechanism used by juvenile courts to assure quality programs are the quality assurance managers for the targeted treatments (Aggression Replacement Therapy- ART and Functional Family Therapy - FFT). These staff certify and evaluate the quality of the programs and the instructors/therapists. They regularly report program-level, quality assurance information back to the local courts as well as cumulatively to the WAJCA.

RESEARCH

Juvenile court intervention programs have benefitted from close association with evaluation and research from the Washington Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP) and the Washington State Center for Court Research. For example, Dr. Barney Barnoski, working with the Juvenile Court Administrators, is the primary architect for the Washington State Juvenile Court Assessment. Barney Barnoski, Steve Aos, Elizabeth Drake and others at WSIPP have provided objective evaluations of evidence-based programs, recidivism, disposition alternatives, and other aspects of juvenile court and juvenile probation operations. Among other beneficial effects, WSIPP research has helped focus the entire juvenile court community on the value of evidence and effectiveness; in turn, the juvenile courts have been able to demonstrate the value of their programs to youth, families, communities, and the State.

New collaboration between the Center for Court Research and the juvenile courts focuses on review of the juvenile offender assessment system and reports, with an eye to improving report validity, documentation, and usefulness to managing overall caseload, understanding differences across juvenile probation counselors' caseloads, monitoring and reporting on offender participation in treatment programs, and evaluating the effectiveness of treatment programs for different groups (such as groups defined by age, race, and sex) and in different parts of the State.

FUNDING

Juvenile Court programs are funded approximately 50% with state money. Juvenile court programs are sustained through a partnership of state and local funds. Without sustainable funding from both the state and local government, these thorough and quality programs would be compromised.