OFFICE OF FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

LOSS PREVENTION REVIEW TEAM

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL AND HEALTH SERVICES

JUVENILE REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

INCIDENTS OF JULY AND SEPTEMBER 2002

Report to the Director of the Office of Financial Management

JULY 2004

Visit the Loss Prevention Review Team website at
http://www.ofm.wa.gov.rmd/lprt/loss.htm

OFFICE OF FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

STATE OF WASHINGTON

LOSS PREVENTION REVIEW TEAM

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL AND HEALTH SERVICES
JUVENILE REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

INCIDENTS OF JULY AND SEPTEMBER 2002

Report to the Director of the Office of Financial Management

JULY 2004

Office of Financial Management

Department of Social and Health Services
Juvenile Rehabilitation Administration

INCIDENTS OF JULY AND SEPTEMBER 2002

Table of Contents

SECTION 1 - EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 1

SECTION 2 - REVIEW PROCESS 3

SECTION 3 - FACTS RELATING TO INCIDENTS UNDER REVIEW 5
- 3.1 YOUTH #1 INCIDENT 5
- 3.1.1 BRIEF BIOGRAPHY OF YOUTH #1 5
- 3.1.2 CRIMINAL HISTORY OF YOUTH #1 6
- 3.1.3 FIRST COMMITMENT OF YOUTH #1 – MAPLE LANE SCHOOL - DECEMBER 4, 2000 THROUGH NOVEMBER 12, 2001 7
- 3.2 YOUTH #2 INCIDENT 8
- 3.2.1 BRIEF BIOGRAPHY OF YOUTH #2 8
- 3.2.2 CRIMINAL HISTORY 8
- 3.2.3 COMMITMENT: MISSION CREEK - JANUARY 17, 2002 – FEBRUARY 15, 2002 CAMP OUTLOOK FEBRUARY 19, 2002 – JUNE 19, 2002 (120 DAYS) 10
- 3.3 APPLICATION OF INTENSIVE PAROLE STANDARDS IN THESE TWO CASES 11

SECTION 4 - OBSERVATIONS AND ANALYSIS 12

SECTION 5 - RECOMMENDATIONS 17

Appendices

Appendix A - Incident Reports A-1

Appendix B - Loss Prevention Review Team Members B-1

Appendix C - Document Log C-1

Appendix D - Timeline for Youth #1 and Youth #2 ..... D-1

Appendix E - Application of Intensive Parole Standards in These Cases E-1

Office of Financial Management
Loss Prevention Review Team

Department of Social and Health Services
Juvenile Rehabilitation Administration

INCIDENTS OF JULY AND SEPTEMBER 2002

SECTION 1 - EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Context: Recently enacted legislation (Chapter 43.41 RCW) charges the Office of Financial Management (OFM) with responsibility for identifying incidents of "death of a person, serious injury to a person, or other substantial loss…alleged or suspected to be caused at least in part by the actions of a state agency" (RCW 43.41.370 (1)), and with evaluating the causes to determine whether changes to policies and processes could reduce risk of future loss. In 2002, the Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS) reported two such incidents to OFM. In both, juvenile offenders with extensive criminal records and prior incarcerations at Juvenile Rehabilitation Administration (JRA) institutions committed serious offenses involving death and personal injury while on parole.

Selection of Incidents for Review: OFM selected these incidents for review from the list of dozens of incidents reported by many state agencies because of the number of similar occurrences with juvenile offenders who re-offend while on parole, and because of the serious nature of the offenses. Review team members, subject matter experts in relevant fields, were asked to analyze the incidents with a focus on causation and on preventative measures DSHS might consider for future implementation. The review expressly excluded formulation and expression of opinions on the performance of specific DSHS personnel.

Observations: After a thorough examination of the record[1], the team found a number of areas in which JRA's approach to management of the two cases did not result in rehabilitation. Rehabilitation plans, from institutional and community placement to parole contracts were ineffective because they were largely ignored by these two parolees and not well enforced by Community Counselors. The Intensive Parole Standards applied in the two cases were unrealistic. Guidelines for parole revocation were unclear. Community Counselors had few tools available to them to enforce rules for which they were held accountable. Recognizing that JRA has no placement authority, there were no good placement alternatives to dysfunctional home environments available to offenders upon completion of their incarceration.

[1] Please see Appendix C for a list of documents the Review Team analyzed.

Recommendations: While acknowledging that no amount of thoughtful policy and operational work on the part of JRA can guarantee that these or other similarly situated offenders will not commit future offenses, the team recommended changes to some JRA practices:

1. A customized development plan for each youth serving time;
2. A customized parole contract upon release;
3. A complete review and revision of the Intensive Parole Standards;
4. Guidelines to aid JRA staff when an offender's family refuses to participate in the rehabilitation process;
5. Development of effective sanctions and incentives to help manage offenders' behavior;
6. Improved communication across organizational boundaries;
7. Analysis of the Community Counselor job class and its compensation;
8. Exploration of placement alternatives (acknowledging the lack of specific legal authority to make placements) for youth offenders leaving institutions;
9. Consideration of a mentoring program to benefit youth offenders; and
10. Exploration of ways to encourage youth offenders to participate in treatment opportunities.

SECTION 2 - REVIEW PROCESS

Statutory Basis for Review: In compliance with RCW 43.41.370 (4), the Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS) reported two incidents to the Office of Financial Management (OFM) in July and September 2002. Both incidents involved felonies committed by youth offenders under the supervision of DSHS's Juvenile Rehabilitation Administration. One involved a murder and the other a vehicular assault resulting in serious injuries. The Director of OFM, pursuant to RCW 43.41.370 (1), determined that these two incidents merited review and appointed a team to conduct the review.

Team Members: Review team members were selected for specific subject-matter expertise. They are:

- Victoria Roberts, Community Protection Administrator, Department of Corrections, Olympia
- Betsy Sawyers, Human Resources Director, Pierce County Human Resources, Tacoma
- Virginia Swanson, retired Regional Administrator, Department of Social and Health Services, Juvenile Rehabilitation Administration, Yakima
- George Yeannakis, Clinical Professor, Seattle University School of Law, Seattle

Review Process: The team met for the first time on September 19, 2003. At that meeting members received initial information about the incidents and executed confidentiality agreements. They also identified key documents relating to the history, treatment and management of the two offenders, and the documents were then requested from DSHS.

In the following weeks, DSHS provided hundreds of pages of records from the institutions where the offenders were committed, from the Community Counselors' files and from the agency headquarters' policy and procedures manuals. DSHS's Policy & Quality Program Administrator for the Juvenile Rehabilitation Administration attended an October meeting to clarify the content of specific documents provided by DSHS. The team identified key individuals knowledgeable about the two incidents and about agency practice, such as the Regional Administrator and the Community Counselors[2] involved with the two offenders, and interviewed them in November 2003. In subsequent meetings, the team analyzed the information before it and formulated the observations, analysis and recommendations that make up the body of this report.

The team is aware that DSHS has made a number changes to its parole program and policies since the two incidents under review occurred. This report analyzes the policies

[2] The objective of this review is to identify systemic problems and suggest process improvements that could help prevent future loss, not to criticize the performance of those involved in the incidents. For that reason, DSHS employees who worked with the two offenders discussed in this report are not referred to by name.

and procedures in effect at the time the incidents occurred only, and does not comment on work done by DSHS subsequently.

Publication: Prior to report publication, the review team met with DSHS representatives to present its recommendations and offered DSHS an opportunity to ask clarifying questions. Then, pursuant to RCW 43.41.380, the report was delivered to the Director of OFM and made public by distribution of hard copies and posting on OFM's website. RCW 43.41.380 (1) and (2) provide that the report is subject to public disclosure, but is not admissible in a civil or administrative proceeding except to impeach a fact witness.

Note on Confidentiality: As part of its work, the Review Team examined documents compiled by JRA that are confidential under state and federal law. The Loss Prevention Review Team is specifically prohibited from disclosing the contents of confidential documents in its report. This, of legal necessity, limits the level of detail found in the team's analysis in some parts of the report.

SECTION 3 - FACTS RELATING TO INCIDENTS UNDER REVIEW

3.1 YOUTH #1 INCIDENT

On July 31, 2002, Youth #1 and two other juvenile males were involved in the beating death of a homeless woman. She died of blunt force trauma to the head and neck. She had been punched and kicked while on the ground. Youth #1 pled guilty to the murder. DSHS's report of this incident appears in Appendix A of this report.

3.1.1 BRIEF BIOGRAPHY OF YOUTH #1

At the time of this offense, Youth #1 was seventeen years old. The Juvenile Rehabilitation Administration (JRA) program used computer assignment to place Youth #1 in a setting that included opportunities to address organic, clinical and psychosocial issues that JRA identified in the course of Youth #1's various detentions with the agency. Confidentiality considerations preclude this report from discussing the specifics of his treatment, his family background and the circumstances in which he lived. By obscuring identifying information about Youth #1, the report could have gone into some detail regarding diagnosis and treatment success and failures. However, the incident was too highly publicized to provide Youth #1 with a sufficient degree of privacy protection, so the Review Team has omitted a detailed discussion of these facts from the biography.

3.1.2 CRIMINAL HISTORY OF YOUTH #1

- **1998: Burglary 2nd Degree and Malicious Mischief**
  Youth #1 was first sentenced in 1998 to twelve months of Community Supervision. He and an accomplice had been arrested by Des Moines Police Officers after the two broke into Pacific Middle School. They were apprehended trying to exit the school. The boys had broken windows, computers and vending machines, and had gone through shelves and cupboards breaking everything they found there.

The community supervision was to end April 29, 1999. In March, Youth #1 received additional adjudications, and was assigned three more months of community supervision for Criminal Trespass and Theft 3rd degree. He had trespassed on Chinook Middle School property, which violated the court's order to avoid after-hours contact with school premises. He also attempted to rob a convenience store and assaulted a store clerk in the process.

During this initial period of community supervision, he left in-patient treatment, and lived with his family. Shortly after the disposition hearing referring him to JRA for community supervision for an additional three months, Youth #1 left the state to reside with his father without the permission of the court. As a matter of law, this is a violation of community supervision, and resulted in the court issuing warrants.

He returned to Washington with outstanding warrants and turned himself in to authorities to get the matter "cleared up." He received an additional sentence of more community supervision. In December 1999, Youth #1 broke into a Budget rental car with a screwdriver. He received more community supervision for this adjudication.

- **2000: Theft 1st Degree**

Youth #1 was sentenced in King County on November 21, 2000 to 52 to 65 weeks, consecutive to his Burglary 2nd adjudication. On August 18, 2000 Youth #1 robbed an eight-year-old boy of $20.00 at a toy store check out counter. He walked up behind the victim, snatched the money out of his hand and fled the store. Store security notified police, who arrested him. After serving his time for this offense, he was released to his mother's residence on November 12, 2001.

- **2000: Taking a Motor Vehicle Without Owner's Permission**
  Prior to sentencing on his Theft 1st adjudication, Youth #1 had two additional charges pending: TMVWOP and Burglary. His mother reported her car as stolen after reporting him to the police as a runaway. He and his sister had used her spare key to drive away in the vehicle. On April 6, 2000, Youth #1 and another person were pulled over and arrested by police officers. These charges were dismissed when he was sentenced for Theft 1st.

- **2000: Burglary 2nd Degree**
  On November 21, 2000 in King County, Youth #1 was sentenced to 15 to 36 weeks in JRA custody pursuant to his Theft 1st adjudication. On April 27, 2000 he forced his way into an espresso stand and stole food items. He told police officers that he had taken the food because he was hungry. The officers arrested him in a tent; he reported that he was living in the tent at the time.

3.1.3 FIRST COMMITMENT OF YOUTH #1 – MAPLE LANE SCHOOL - DECEMBER 4, 2000 THROUGH NOVEMBER 12, 2001

After completing court ordered assessment forms, Youth #1 was assigned by the computer to Maple Lane School. DSHS's annual report describes Maple Lane as a treatment-based facility for juveniles with medical or substance abuse issues. Because of confidentiality restrictions related to the contents of the records, the review team is unable to recount the detail found in the documents.

The documents reviewed reflect an assessment of Youth #1's social background, clinical records, and a record of his behavior while at Maple Lane. The review team recommendations reflect the correlations the team noted between staff reaction to Youth #1's conduct and his subsequent behavior in the facility. Of particular concern was the inconsistency of applying sanctions in the numerous incidents where his behavior was outside the code of conduct, and the questionable ability to correctly identify causes of behaviors and respond to them.

Commission of and Sentencing for Last Crime. The review team found that during this period of time, JRA's Community Counselor attempted to monitor Youth #1's whereabouts. During this same period of time, Kent Police identified Youth #1 as a person suspected of assaulting homeless people in the Kent area.

On July 31, 2002, the body of a homeless woman who had been beaten to death was found in the same area Youth #1 frequented. Court records describe the Kent Police department's sleuthing to identify the assailants of the victim. Youth #1 was clearly identified, and his bloody clothing and shoes were found at his

girlfriend's apartment. With the assistance of his attorney, Youth #1 turned himself in to the Seattle Police Department. He pled guilty to Murder 2nd on May 23, 2003 and was sentenced to 184 months in the Washington State Penitentiary. He was 18 years old.

3.2 YOUTH #2 INCIDENT

Youth #2 stole a car in Everett and spent the night driving around Bellevue and Seattle with friends. The next morning, police attempted to pull him over. A high-speed chase ensued. The pursuit ended when Youth #2 drove the car onto the sidewalk and into a parking lot. He struck several other vehicles and a pedestrian, causing the pedestrian injuries that took over a year to heal. He attempted to run away from the scene, but was apprehended. DSHS's report of this incident to OFM appears in Appendix A.

3.2.1 BRIEF BIOGRAPHY OF YOUTH #2

Youth #2 was born in 1985. As with Youth #1, the Review Team evaluated DSHS JRA records that included social history, medical and mental health evaluations and educational records. Due to confidentiality concerns because of the highly publicized nature of this incident, and the restrictions against disclosure of juvenile records, the detail of the team's research is not included in this report. The Review Team concluded that DSHS identified Youth #2 as facing organic and clinical issues, family of origin issues, and that he required a support system unavailable to him in the normal course of his life.

3.2.2 CRIMINAL HISTORY OF YOUTH #2

2001 – 2002 Taking a Motor Vehicle Without Owner's Permission (TMVWOP). Starting in January of 2001, Youth #2 was convicted of stealing more than seven cars.

A chronology (extensively edited to omit entries from nondisclosable sources) assembled from court documents, institutional records and the case file maintained by the Community Counselor shows the pattern of Youth #2 continuing to steal cars on a regular basis, and the Community Counselor attempting, with limited success, to work with the offender and his family as JRA's standards require.

May 5, 2001	Youth #2 was charged with Malicious Mischief 3rd.
August 9, 2001	Youth #2 committed Theft 3rd.
August 15, 2001	Youth #2 stole a car and was charged with TMVWOP.
September 14, 2001	Youth #2 stole another car and was again charged with TMVWOP.
October 15, 2001	Youth #2 was sentenced to Regular Probation for one year for three car thefts that occurred in August and September of 2001.
November 15, 2001	Youth #2 stole another car and was charged with TMVWOP.
January 11, 2002	Youth #2 received a Manifest Injustice sentence of plus 43 weeks, less 57 days credit for time served.
January 17, 2002	Youth #2 was placed at Mission Creek Youth Camp and then transferred to Camp Outlook (boot camp).
June 17, 2002	Youth #2 was released from the institution to parole.
July 18, 2002	The family notified the Community Counselor that Youth #2 was whereabouts unknown. A warrant was issued.
July 26, 2002	Youth #2 committed two counts TMVWOP 2.
July 29, 2002	Youth #2 was taken into custody and then released.
September 6, 2002	Youth #2 was still whereabouts unknown, so an arrest warrant was issued.
September 19, 2002	Youth #2 was arrested for Eluding and Vehicular Assault.
September 20, 2002	JRA filed a Critical Incident Report.
October 22, 2002	A decline hearing was held. The Court recommended Manifest Injustice plus 15 to 36 weeks.

3.2.3 COMMITMENT OF YOUTH #2 - MISSION CREEK - JANUARY 17, 2002 – FEBRUARY 15, 2002; CAMP OUTLOOK FEBRUARY 19, 2002 – JUNE 19, 2002 (120 DAYS)

The Review Team evaluated Youth #2's institutional adjustment, treatment and infractions while he resided at Mission Creek. Again, confidentiality concerns preclude detailed description of the treatment or other aspects of his stay. The Review Team can state that Youth #2's tenure at Mission Creek was unremarkable, and he met typical DSHS expectations that the rules would not be violated due to the deterrent effect of JRA's sanctions. The sanction for rules violation is loss of a sentence reduction, expulsion from the program, and return to another JRA institution for the remainder of the sentence. In Youth #2's case, that would mean serving 43 rather than 26 weeks.

- *Release on Parole.* After serving the statutory requirement of 120 days at Camp Outlook, Youth #2 was released to serve the remainder of his sentence on Basic Training Camp Aftercare, which is the same as Intensive Parole. Youth #2's Community Counselor was unaware that Youth #2 was on Intensive Parole (Basic Training Camp Aftercare) rather than Regular Parole for the first few weeks after his release. The Community Counselor's supervisor was new to her job and was also unaware that Youth #2 was supposed to be on Intensive Parole.

- *Parole Compliance.* While on parole after his release from Boot Camp on June 20, 2002, Youth #2's compliance with supervision was poor. He committed the following violations:

July 13, 2002	Youth #2 ran away from home.
July 18, 2002	Youth #2 remained on whereabouts unknown status, so a warrant was issued.
July 26, 2002	Youth #2 was arrested for two counts of TMVWOP 2 in Renton.
September 6, 2002	Youth #2 was still on whereabouts unknown status, so a warrant was issued.
September 19, 2002	Youth #2 was arrested on charges of Eluding and Vehicular Assault (the incident being reviewed)

Commission of and Sentencing for Last Offense. On the evening of September 18, 2002, Youth #2 stole a car in Everett. The next morning, the owner of the car reported the theft to the police and took the bus to work in downtown Seattle. As she stood at an intersection near her office building, she saw her car speed through the intersection pursued by a police car with siren and lights activated. It almost hit her. Instead, it struck a 67-year-old woman standing nearby, and then crashed into four other cars. Youth #2 and two other juvenile males jumped out of the car; Youth #2 ran away, but was soon apprehended by police. The woman hit by the car spent several months in a body cast while her fractured spine, pelvis and legs healed.

Youth #2 was charged with and convicted of Eluding and with Vehicular Assault, and received a Manifest Injustice sentence of 124.9 to 156 weeks confinement.

3.3 APPLICATION OF INTENSIVE PAROLE STANDARDS IN THESE TWO CASES

To summarize the interaction between the two youth offenders and the Juvenile Rehabilitation Administration, the team reviewed the Intensive Parole Standards in effect at the time, determined whether the standards were satisfied for each offender, and drew conclusions about the standards themselves. The detailed results of this analysis appear in Appendix E.

SECTION 4 - OBSERVATIONS AND ANALYSIS

4.1 Observations and Analysis Specific to Youth #1

4.1.1 Parole Contract. A number of Youth #1's parole conditions were not imposed or enforced for substantial periods of time. Youth #1 was on unauthorized leave on four occasions for periods ranging from five to 150 days. Although numerous threats to issue a warrant were made, only three warrants were issued and only one warrant resulted in any sanctions.

JRA's program requires youth offenders on supervision to sign orders of parole conditions. If these are not adhered to, an arrest warrant may be issued. On July 5, 2002 Youth #1 signed a new order of parole conditions. He violated all of these conditions within a week and a warrant for his arrest was issued on July 19, 2002. He was picked up on the warrant on July 27, 2002 and was released without significant consequence (verbal warning only) on July 29, 2002. Based on review of these two offenders' histories and statements made in an interview with a Community Counselor, it appeared that offenders ignored their parole contracts, signing whatever was put before them as an unavoidable part of the process rather than a deliberate commitment to behavioral standards.

4.1.2 Sanctions. Prior to JRA commitment, the local sanctions imposed by the Juvenile Court on Youth #1 for his various early offenses were ineffective in controlling his criminal behavior.

4.1.3 Sanctions. Parole conditions that were violated were not dealt with or sanctioned.

4.1.4 Use of Information. The Review Team found that JRA did not take seriously alarming statements and disclosures made to JRA institutional staff by Youth #1, nor were they dealt with in a meaningful way. However, statements predicting future violent behavior are in Youth #1's records from an early point in his interaction with JRA.

4.1.5 Use of Information. Effective coordination of information from different sources did not occur. This meant that material information as to Youth #1's conduct, whereabouts and potential treatment needs did not reach responsible JRA staff. The Review Team took particular note of the Determination of Probable Cause for Youth #1's current adjudication, which states that "Some Kent officers were aware of the recent incidents of violence to homeless people in the area near where the body was found. The officers familiar with the problems of this neighborhood told detectives that a person named [Youth #1] is suspected of assaulting homeless people and that he frequents the area …… less than one block from where [the murder victim's] body was found." It is unknown if this information was ever shared with JRA staff, and therefore, unknown whether, had they had the information, JRA staff could have intervened to prevent the events of July 31, 2002. While the crime for which Youth #1 is now serving time in the state penitentiary, homicide, may not have been directly foreseeable, escalating behaviors noted in the certification of probable cause, specifically, suspicion of assault on homeless people, should have caused concern and intervention on the part of JRA staff had they known.

4.1.6 Cooperation. While on parole, Youth #1 failed to follow through with any referrals by JRA staff. Although JRA staff made numerous attempts to engage Youth #1 and his mother in the transition process, this goal remained essentially unmet due to the resistance of both. They were often unresponsive to JRA staff's attempts to involve them in the planning process and repeatedly refused programming opportunities that were made available to them.

4.2 Observations and Analysis Specific to Youth #2

4.2.1 Planning Process. Specific organic, clinically manifested concerns were identified by JRA, but these were not evaluated or addressed in JRA's planning process. For example, the records revealed little connection between the diagnostic tools used upon Youth #2's admission to the institution and the plan for future progress in the institution and in the community.

4.2.2 Parole Contract. Youth #2's parole contract was a form document not tailored to his specific situation and developmental needs. It appears to have been executed after-the-fact rather than in preparation for his return to the community.

4.2.3 Parole Standards. According to the standards in effect at the time, Youth #2 was to have been put on electronic surveillance for the first 15 days of his parole, a requirement of Intensive Parole. This did not occur because neither his Community Counselor nor the Community Counselor's supervisor realized that Youth #2 was to be on Basic Training Camp Aftercare, which is equivalent to Intensive Parole, rather than Regular Parole. Basic conditions of parole were not imposed, and the exceptions process was not used.

4.2.4 Sanctions. Youth #2 was arrested and brought to detention for stealing cars, but received no sanctions as a result. He was released, and he re-offended.

4.2.5 Mentoring. There was little or no effort to provide Youth #2 with continuous positive mentoring influence from the time he entered the institution to his release into the community.

4.3 General Observations and Analysis

4.3.1 Planning Process. JRA's program required it to address specific clinical issues that may have contributed to or posed barriers to rehabilitation. For these two offenders, their plans were silent as to their identified special needs.

4.3.2 Parole Standards. Many of the Intensive Parole Standards in effect at the time of these incidents were unrealistic, unachievable and too rigid to be used effectively in offender supervision. These standards held Community Counselors accountable for enforcing compliance that was simply impossible to accomplish in many circumstances.

4.3.3 Parole Standards. These two offenders received the same treatment as if they had been on regular parole; it didn't matter that they were on Intensive Parole (or Basic Training Camp Aftercare). One youth was on Regular Parole for over a month before it was discovered that he was supposed to be on Intensive Parole. He received the same level of supervision and services, or lack thereof, throughout the term of parole.

4.3.4 Sanctions. The decision-making process for revocation of parole after violation or re-offense was unclear, as were alternatives to revocation. Community Counselors lacked meaningful diagnostic tools in terms of sentences and sanctions, and lacked the legal authority to enforce terms of the parole contract.

4.3.5 Sanctions. Sanctions lacked immediacy in both cases reviewed. Often, a substantial period of time passed between an offense or violation and consequences.

4.3.6 Human Resources. There appeared to be an issue with consistent staffing for the supervision of youth released on parole. This may have been due to high turnover. New employees did not necessarily have the knowledge, experience and competencies to immediately take over a case from a predecessor.

4.3.7 Alternative Placements. Although JRA does not have placement authority, it is important to note that there were few placement options available for offenders leaving JRA institutions, and as a consequence, they often returned to the same living environment in which they initially offended. Their living environments may have been a contributing factor to these offenders' behavior.

SECTION 5 - RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are based on the Review Team's examination of the two reported incidents only. The Review Team encourages DSHS to determine whether the issues identified apply system wide.

5.1 **Planning Process.** An initial development plan for each youth should be individually tailored to his or her needs inside the institution, taking into consideration all available information on the youth, including assessments, diagnostics and medical records. A thoughtful and detailed transition plan should then be developed to bridge the youth from the institutional to the community setting. It should be prepared by a transition specialist or multi-disciplinary team, rather than the Community Counselor or other field staff who have limited time available for such work due to heavy caseloads. This plan should be a development plan that addresses disabilities, positive mentoring, educational programming, occupational therapy or physical therapy and other transition needs.

5.2 **Parole Contracts.** Parole Contracts should facilitate juveniles' reintegration into the community by supporting individual treatment plans. The individual treatment plan could incorporate all the restrictive covenants of the old parole contract, but the restrictions would be linked with achievable goals. This might help focus the youth on the rehabilitative goal of parole.

5.3 **Parole Standards.** All the Intensive Parole standards need to be reviewed and revised so that they more realistically address what is possible to accomplish with severely troubled youth. The standards should be more flexible, offer a range of options, and provide practical guidance on managing difficult offenders and their families.

5.4 **Parole Standards.** The standards should provide guidance for the Community Counselor on what to do when an offender's family does not or cannot participate in the rehabilitation process.

5.5 **Sanctions.** JRA should explore options for more effective sanctions to curb unacceptable behavior, as well as incentives for desirable behavior. In general, sanctions should follow the offense as quickly as possible. JRA's warrant process needs to be revisited and revised. The standards for revocation should be detailed and should give clear guidance to the Community Counselors on when it's appropriate to revoke.

5.6 Use of Information. It appears that better results might be achieved if DSHS employees in various functions and divisions would communicate and work together across organizational boundaries (detention, parole, Children's Administration, local law enforcement, etc.). This could be critical in a case like Youth #1's where valuable information in the probable cause certification apparently didn't reach JRA personnel who needed to see it.

5.7 Staff Qualifications. JRA should work with DSHS Human Resources and the Department of Personnel to complete a job analysis review and market study of the JRA Community Counselor Classification. The job description and compensation should better reflect the required knowledge, skills, abilities and competencies in relation to the duties and responsibilities of the job. The Social Worker class series should be looked at as a possible better match for job requirements and compensation for the purpose of recruitment and retention. This could lower turnover, increase job satisfaction and improve the results achieved by JRA.

5.8 Placement Alternatives. JRA should work with other divisions of DSHS and with the State Legislature to explore the development of more placement options for offenders leaving institutions who are likely to repeat old patterns if returned to the home environment in which they initially committed their offenses.

5.9 Mentoring. JRA should explore a mentoring program to expand positive influences for youth offenders returning to the community.

5.10 Cooperation. JRA should explore development programs that encourage youth and families to participate in treatment opportunities.

A P P E N D I C E S

Appendix A - Incident Reports

This report is submitted to OFM for the sole purpose of fulfilling the notification requirement in RCW 43.41.370(4) as further described in the Guidelines for Reporting Incidents to OFM. This report is not an admission of fault nor has any determination of fault been made. The information reported is a brief summary of known facts at this time and is subject to change.

AGENCY NAME:

DSHS (JRA)

NAME OF PERSON MAKING REPORT:

Bernie Friedman, 902-7860, friedbh@dshs.wa.gov

DATE OF INCIDENT OR LOSS:

July 31, 2002

NAME OF PERSON, DESCRIPTION OF INCIDENT OR LOSS:

On August 8, 2002, a JRA parolee was arrested and charged with murder 2° in the alleged beating death of a 44-year-old homeless female in Kent.

AGENCY CONTACT PERSON (NAME, TITLE, TELEPHONE NUMBER AND EMAIL ADDRESS)

Bernie Friedman, Special Assistant to the Secretary for Loss Prevention and Risk Management, 902-7860, friedbh@dshs.wa.gov

HAS THE AGENCY CONVENED AN INTERNAL REVIEW PROCESS? IF YES, PROVIDE INFORMATION ON THE STATUS OF THE REVIEW:

Yes. The regional office conducted a case management review.

Office of
Financial Management
State of Washington

This report is submitted to OFM for the sole purpose of fulfilling the notification requirement in RCW 43.41.370(4) as further described in the Guidelines for Reporting Incidents to OFM. This report is not an admission of fault nor has any determination of fault been made. The information reported is a brief summary of known facts at this time and is subject to change.

AGENCY NAME:

Department of Social and Health Services
Juvenile Rehabilitation Administration (JRA)

NAME OF PERSON MAKING REPORT:

Liz Dunbar
Deputy Secretary

DATE OF INCIDENT OR LOSS:

September 19, 2002

NAME OF PERSON, DESCRIPTION OF INCIDENT OR LOSS:

JRA parolee charged with vehicular assault and eluding police.

AGENCY CONTACT PERSON (Name, title, telephone number and email address):

Lois Nicholas, JRA Region 4 Administrator

HAS THE AGENCY CONVENED AN INTERNAL REVIEW PROCESS? IF YES, PROVIDE INFORMATION ON THE STATUS OF THE REVIEW:

The regional office conducted a case management review.

Appendix B - Loss Prevention Review Team

Agency: Department of Social & Health Services, Region 4 JRA Office

TEAM MEMBERS:

Name and Title	CONTACT INFORMATION
Victoria Roberts Community Corrections Program Administrator Department of Corrections	**Address:** PO Box 42117 Olympia, WA 98504-2117 **Telephone:** 360-753-1678 **E-mail:** mailto:vroberts@DOC1.wa.gov
Betsy Sawyers Human Resources Director Pierce County Human Resources	**Address:** 615 S. 9th St. Suite 200 Tacoma, WA 98405 **Telephone:** 253-798-7480 **E-mail:** esawyer@co.pierce.wa.us
Virginia Swanson Retired Regional Administrator, Department of Social and Health Services, Juvenile Rehabilitation Administration	**Address:** 1301 Beaudry Road Yakima, WA 98901 **Telephone**: **509-452-0778** **E-mail:** swansvf@bentonrea.com
George Yeannakis Clinical Professor Seattle University School of Law	**Address:** Sullivan Hall 900 Broadway Seattle, WA 98122-4340 **Telephone:** 206-398-4148 **E-mail**: yeannakis@seattleu.edu

Appendix C - Document Log

Doc #	Date Rec'd	Description of Document
JRA-01	8/1/03	Administrative Report of Incidents, Parole Programs, 9/20/02
JRA -02	8/1/03	Predisposition diagnostic Report, 1/14/02
JRA -03	8/1/03	Diagnostic/Placement Record of Official Action, 1/16/02
JRA -04	8/1/03	Summary of Court Referrals, 6/14/01 to 11/1/02
JRA -05	8/1/03	Transition Report, 5/5/02
JRA -06	8/1/03	Record of Official Action, 6/19/02
JRA -07	8/1/03	Youth Competency Intervention Report/Plan and summaries, 6/18/02
JRA -08	8/1/03	Youth Competency Intervention Report/Plan and summaries, 7/17/02
JRA -09	8/1/03	Order of Conditions of Parole 7/29/02 and 5/31/02
JRA -10	8/1/03	Parole Contacts/Case Notes, 5/22/02 to 10/3/02
JRA-11	8/1/03	Administrative Report of Incidents, Parole Programs, 8/5/ 02
JRA-12	8/1/03	Predisposition Diagnostic Report, 9/20/00
JRA-13	8/1/03	Diagnostic/Placement Record of Official Action, 11/21/00
JRA-14	8/1/03	Summary of Court Referrals, 1/31/98 – 4/28/00
JRA-15	8/1/03	Transition Report, 10/3/
JRA-16	8/1/03	Response to Transition Reports/Initial Service Plan, 10/18/01
JRA-17	8/1/03	Record of Official Action, 11/11/01
JRA-18	8/1/03	Youth Competency Intervention Report/Plan and Summaries, 10/22/01 and 12/20/01
JRA-19	8/1/03	Order of Conditions of Parole, 11/13/01 and 7/5/02
JRA-20	8/1/03	Parole Contacts/Case Notes, 12/15/00 to 5/ 27/03
JRA-21	8/1/03	Parole Caseload Reductions Memorandum, 4/29/02
JRA-22	8/1/03	Interim Directive, Parole Restructuring, 7/3/02
JRA-23	8/1/03	JRA Intensive Parole Standards in place pertinent to clients' parole periods, 2/1/02 to 7/29/02 NS 7/30/02 TO 1/1/03
JRA-24	8/1/03	JRA Human Resource Development Plan, 2001-2003
JRA-25	10/6/03	Diagnostic information for Youth #1 – Section ✓ Face Sheet ✓ Diagnostic Record of Official Actions ✓ Psychiatric or Psychological ✓ Psychosocial ✓ Social History ✓ Other diagnostic material
JRA-26	10/6/03	Section II –Youth #1 Legal ✓ Sentencing Report ✓ Movement Sheet ✓ Court Orders ✓ Pre- commitment Reports (Court, Police, etc.) Legal correspondence other legal material
JRA-27	10/6/03	Section III - Youth #1 ✓ Medical & Dental ✓ Educational & Vocational

Doc #	Date Rec'd	Description of Document
JRA -28	10/6/03	Medical File –Youth #1
JRA-29	10/6/03	Section IV – Youth #1 Parole ✓ Parole Reports ✓ Community Reports & Correspondence
JRA-30	10/6/03	Section V – Youth #1 Residential ✓ Sentencing Log ✓ Release From Sentence Reports ✓ Authorized Leave Documents ✓ Critical Incident Reports ✓ Case Correspondence and Documents, i.e. Birth Records, etc.
JRA-31	10/6/03	Section VI – Youth #1 Residential ✓ Record of Official Actions ✓ Initial Treatment Report ✓ Treatment Reports ✓ Placement Referrals and Correspondence ✓ Updated Psychological, etc.
JRA-32	10/6/03	Section I – Youth #2 Diagnostic
JRA 33	10/6/03	Section II –Youth #2 Legal ✓ Sentencing Report ✓ Movement Sheet ✓ Court Orders ✓ Pre-commitment Reports (court, Police, etc.) ✓ Legal correspondence ✓ Other legal material
JRA -34	10/6/03	Section III – Youth #2 ✓ Medical & Dental ✓ Educational and Vocational
JRA-35	10/6/03	Section IV Youth #2 - Parole ✓ Parole Reports ✓ Community Reports & Correspondence
JRA-36	10/6/03	Section V - Residential ✓ Sentencing Log ✓ Release from Sentence Reports ✓ Authorized Leave Documents ✓ Critical Incident Reports ✓ Case Correspondence & Documents, i.e. Birth Records, etc.
JRA-37	10/6/03	Section VI Residential ✓ Record of Official Actions ✓ Initial Treatment Report ✓ Treatment Reports ✓ Placement Referrals & Correspondence ✓ Updated Psychologicals, etc.
JRA-38	10/6/03	JRA Region 4 Local Policies and Procedures
JRA-39	10/6/03	Bulletin Revision Schedule Bulletins 1 – 42
JRA-40	10/6/03	Parole Caseload Reductions
JRA-41	10/6/03	Bulletin Updates

Doc #	Date Rec'd	Description of Document
JRA-42	10/6/03	10/6/03 Memo to OFM from DSHS regarding documents
JRA-43	10/6/03	WA State Juvenile Court Recidivism Estimates: FY 1994 Youth – WSIPP
JRA-44	10/6/03	Felony Recidivism Rates
JRA-45	10/6/03	Violent Felony Recidivism Rates
JRA-46	10/6/03	Region Charts
JRA-47	10/8/03	Newspaper articles
JRA-48	10/19/03	JRA 18 Month Recidivism Rate History chart with Felony or Misdemeanor Recidivism, Felony Recidivism & Misdemeanor Recidivism tables supporting information attached
JRA-49	10/22/03	Integrated Treatment Model report
JRA-50	10/22/03	Executive Summary – JRA – Integrated Treatment Model
JRA-51	10/27/03	Personnel Records
JRA-52	10/27/03	Personnel Records
JRA-53	10/29/03	Manifest Injustice Report
JRA-54	10/29/03	HRD activities report for Community Counselors
JRA-55	1/20/04	Certification for Determination of Probable Cause
JRA-56	6/12/04	Department of Corrections Criminal History Summary

Appendix D – Timelines[3]

Youth #1
January 30, 1998 – August 8, 2002

DATE	CONTACT	TEXT
1/30/98		Occurrence date for charges of I – Burg 2 and II – MM1
4/9/98		Plea of guilty to CT 1 – Burg & CT 2 MM2 (as amended)
4/29/98		Disposition for events of 1/30/98
11/10/98		Occurrence date for charge of Theft 3
3/11/99		Occurrence date for charge of CT 2
3/17/99		Det Rvw: rel on cond; ARR held; CSH set 3/31/99
3/28/99		Occurrence date for charge of Theft 3
5/19/99		Bench warrant (note: another warrant apparently issued 5/25/99)
5/25/99		Warrant issued; quashed on 9/17/99
9/27/99		Mod Dispo
10/8/99		Dispo for events of 3/11/99 and 3/28/99
11/17/99		Warrant issued
11/24/99		Detained
11/30/99		Mod
12/3/99		Warrant issued
12/20/99		Occurrence date for charges of I – attempted TMVWP and II – MM2
12/21/99		Detained, warrant served, released
12/27/99		DET RV: detained; arr., held, plea not guilty entered; set for 12/29/99
1/14/00		"Plea: guilty plea entered to att T&R & MM2… released on atta conditions"
3/1/00		FTA Warrant issued
3/6/00		Detained (note; Disp. On 3/8/00)
3/8/00		Dispo
3/24/00		MOD filed; Warrant issued
4/7/00		Detained
4/12/00		Released
4/18/00		Warrant issued
4/27/00		Occurrence date for charge of Burg 2
12/15/00	Youth contact, FTF	
5/9/01	Youth attempted contact	
5/9/01	Family contact, phone	
5/18/01	Youth contact, phone	
5/23/01	Family attempted contact	

[3] This appendix has been heavily edited to protect confidential information.

DATE	CONTACT	TEXT
5/29/01	Family contact, FTF	
5/31/01	Youth contact, phone	
6/14/01	Youth contact, FTF	
6/14/01	Family attempted contact	
7/24/01	Family contact, phone	
7/24/01	Agency contact, phone	
7/25/01	Family attempted contact	
8/30/01	Agency attempted contact	Left messages with JRRC and FIT-Co-Occurring Program
9/11/01	Agency contact, phone	Contacted JRRC and learned of later release date
9/11/01	Agency attempted contact	Left message for CPC
9/11/01	Family attempted contact	
9/19/01	Youth contact FTF	
9/19/01	Family attempted contact	
9/20/01	Youth contact FTF	
10/17/01	Family attempted contact	
10/19/01	Family attempted contact	
10/22/01	Family attempted contact	
11/19/01	Youth contact FTF	
11/20/01	Youth attempted contact	
11/24/01	Youth contact FTF	
11/27/01	Family contact FTF	
11/27/01	Youth attempted contact	
11/28/01	Youth attempted contact	
11/29/01	Youth attempted contact	
11/29/01	Family contact, phone	

DATE	CONTACT	TEXT
11/29/01		Warrant issued for absconder status
12/3/01	Family contact, phone	
12/5/01	Youth contact, Phone	
12/7/01	Youth contact, FTF	
12/10/01	Youth contact, phone	
12/11/01	Youth contact, phone	
12/12/01	Family contact, phone	
12/12/01	Youth attempted contact	
12/13/01		
12/13/01	Agency contact	
12/13/01	Youth contact, phone	
12/14/01	Youth attempted contact	
12/15/01	Agency contact	
12/15/01	Youth contact, phone	
12/17/01	Family contact, phone	
12/17/01	Youth attempted contact; phone	
12/19/01	Agency attempts contact	
12/20/01	Agency contact	
12/21/01	Youth contact; phone	
12/22/01	Agency contact	
12/24/01	Agency attempted contact; phone	
12/26/01	Agency attempted contact	
12/27/01	Agency contact; phone	
12/27/01	Agency attempted contact	
12/28/01	Youth contact; phone	
12/28/01	Agency attempted contact	
12/29/01	Agency contact; phone	
12/31/01	Agency contact	

DATE	CONTACT	TEXT
1/2/02	Agency contact; phone	
1/6/02	Agency contact; phone	
1/8/02	Agency contact	
1/9/02	Agency attempted contact	
1/12/02	Agency contact	
1/14/02	Agency attempted contact	
1/15/02	Family contact	
1/16/02	Agency attempted contact	
1/17/02	Agency attempted phone contact	
1/18/02		
1/19/02	Agency attempted contact	
1/23/02	Agency contact	
1/26/02	Agency contact	
1/28/02	Agency contact	
1/2/02	Agency contact	
1/30/02	Agency attempted contact	
1/31/02	Agency attempted contact	
2/2/02	Agency contact	
2/11/02	Agency contact	
2/19/02		
3/26/02	Agency contact	
4/23/02	Agency attempted contact	
5/22/02		
6/13/02	Agency contact	
6/17/02		
6/18/02	Agency contact	
6/21/02	Agency contact	
7/5/02	Agency contact	
7/5/02	Agency contact	
7/11/02	Agency contact	
7/12/02	Youth contact	

DATE	CONTACT	TEXT
8/2/02		
8/2/02		Agency contacts Kent police, places Youth #1 on warrant
8/7/02	Agency contact	
8/7/02		Seattle police notify agency that Youth #1 taken to King County Jail
8/8/02		Agency gets message from Kent police that Youth #1 turned self in and is in custody

Youth #2
May 3, 2001 – October 25, 2002

DATE	CONTACT	TEXT
5/3/01		Occurrence date for charge of MM 3D (note: the summary of court referrals has 3 different May dates (5/3/00, 5/3/01, 5/30/01) all of which have charge of MM3. One date of 5/3/01 has been selected)
8/9/01		Occurrence date for charge of I-Theft 3
8/15/01		Occurrence date for charge of TMVWP
9/14/01		Occurrence date for charge of I-TMVWOP
10/15/01		DISP: Plea agreement reached
11/15/01		Occurrence date for charge of I TMVWOP
1/11/02		DISP
5/22/02	Agency attempted contact	
5/30/02		Field investigation
6/20/02	Agency contact	
6/28/02	Family contact	
7/2/02	Agency contact	
7/10/02	Agency contact	
7/18/02		
7/18/02		Warrant issued
7/24/02	Agency contact	
7/26/02		Occurrence date for charge of TMVWOP 2, 2 cts (note: charge info filed on 10/24/02)
7/29/02		Informed that Youth #2 picked up and in detention
7/29/02	Agency contact	
8/1/02	Agency contact	
8/9/02	Agency attempted contact	
8/12/02	Agency contact	
8/13/02		
8/15/02	Agency contact	
8/23/02	Agency attempted contact	
8/28/02	Agency contact	
8/30/02	Agency attempted contact	
9/4/02	Agency contact	
9/6/02		
9/11/02	Agency attempted contact	
9/19/02	Agency contact	
9/19/02		Occurrence date for charge of Vehicle Asslt, Elude Police
10/25/02		Youth # 2 taken into custody

APPENDIX E - APPLICATION OF INTENSIVE PAROLE STANDARDS IN THESE CASES

Standard	Youth #1	Youth #2
I. CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM		
I. A. **CASE REPORTING**	--	--
Purpose: To provide a written framework for supervision and rehabilitation efforts; to assess risk/protective factors and youth competencies in order to establish appropriate extensive parole conditions. **Goals:** • Youth and parents report they are part of parole planning and decision-making. • Youth and parents are aware of the initial service plan and parole conditions. • JRA provides quality transition services among residential counselors, community counselors, youth and families around the initial service plan and parole conditions. • Parole conditions are current, realistic and enforceable. • To accurately and regularly assess risk factors, protective factors, and youth competencies. • To involve youth, staff, family, and providers in the development and update of the Competency Intervention Plan and supervision levels. • Youth will have a current Competency Intervention Plan based on team input from the Supervisory Case Review. • CATS has current parole related information on each youth. • The Discharge Report reflects the youth's response to intensive parole supervision and services.		
1.A.1. Youth involved in development of plans and reports. To the extent possible, the youth's parent(s) and/or significant others (e.g., providers, mentors) will have the opportunity to provide input with respect to the youth's Intervention Plan(s) and subsequent reviews and/or meetings to address future case planning and level of supervision.	Standard met	Standard not met
I. A. 2. Response to Transition Report completed in accordance with the instructions contained in the JRA Youth Competency Desk Manual.	Standard met	Standard not met
I. A. 3. If the response is for a release to intensive parole, the Initial Service Plan and accompanying Order of Parole Conditions is written and submitted in accordance with the instructions contained in the JRA Youth Competency Desk Manual.	Standard not met	Standard not met; no service plan provided.
I. A. 4. The Community Counselor (or designee) prepares initial order of parole conditions and reviews and amends as required.	Standard not met	Standard not met
I. A. 5. The assigned Community Counselor completes Intensive Parole Supervision Assessment and Youth Competency Summary/Report within 30-45 active days of intensive parole and every 90 active days thereafter.	Standard met	Standard met; completed on July 17, 2002 while Youth #2's whereabouts were unknown.

Standard	Youth #1	Youth #2
I. A. 6. A Supervisory Case Review is conducted and documented by use of a Supervisory Case Review form within 15 days following the completion of each Intensive Parole Supervision Assessment.	Standard not met within the 15 days required.	Standard not met; the Community Counselor did not realize that Youth #2 was on Intensive Parole, so treated him as a Regular Parolee initially.
I. A. 7. The Community Counselor updates, if necessary, the Competency Intervention Plan within three working days following the Supervisory Case Review.	Standard not met within the three days required.	Standard not met
I. A. 8. A Parole Change Report is the document for recording changes that occur for JRA youths. It is submitted within three working days following any of the changes listed on the report form.	Standard met	Standard met
I. A. 9. The Community Counselor completes a Discharge Report/Intensive Parole Supervision Assessment/Competency Summary Report within 30 days following the official Intensive Parole discharge date.	Not applicable	Standard met; discharge was by recommitment on new charge.
I. B. RESIDENTIAL CASE RESPONSIBILITIES	--	--
Purpose: to facilitate early and continued case planning among youths, families, and residential/community counselors. **Goals:** • The assigned Community Counselor is familiar with the case including potential treatment/transition needs and begins to establish rapport with the youth. • The assigned Community Counselor establishes rapport, gathers information and provides information to the family. • Communication, collaboration, and planning are established to support realistic goals in treatment and transition. • Families are kept informed of youth's status and progress. • Community and Residential Counselors work together to enhance public safety.	Although regular contact and attempts to contact the family and other JRA staff are noted in the chronology, there is not enough detail given to determine the nature of the discussion nor any decisions or action plans that may have resulted from the contact.	--
I. B. 1. Within 30 working days following admission, the Community Counselor reviews Diagnostic Report and contacts the youth either by person or by phone.	Standard met	Standard not met
I. B. 2. Within 30 days following admission (and prior to #3) the Community Counselor attempts to contact (home visit or phone) the family (if youth has family available) to: provide an orientation to JRA; review intensive parole placement options for the youth; solicit family involvement in supporting the youth during commitment and participating in available services in the community; gather family input regarding case planning; and provide an overview of the Competencies Model.	Standard met	Standard not met
I. B. 3. Within 30 days following admission, the Community Counselor contacts the assigned Residential Counselor to provide feedback from the family contact and to discuss recommendations for re-integrative case planning.	Standard met	Standard not met; only one contact was made.

Standard	Youth #1	Youth #2
I. B. 4. The Community Counselor contacts or meets regularly with the family to review and discuss the youth's status and progress.	Standard not met. Several attempts were made to reach Youth #1's family but no actual contact took place with the family.	Standard not met.
I. B. 5. Upon notice of escape from a residential setting, the Community Counselor works cooperatively with residential staff to facilitate the apprehension of escapees.	Not applicable	Not applicable
I. C. TRANSITIONAL CASE RESPONSIBILITIES	--	--
Purpose: to facilitate the youth's reintegration to his/her family and community. To provide adequate pre-release coordination between residential and community programs to ensure a structured and smooth transition. **Goals:** • Families are involved in pre-release and intensive parole planning. • Transition services are improved for youth with placement needs. • The Community Counselor and youth establish a positive relationship and are involved in release planning. • The youth understands the expectations of the parole contact and initial service plan.	The failure of Youth #1 and his family to become engaged in the transition process continued to frustrate the staff's efforts to comply with this set of standards. As noted in B. there is not enough documentation to determine what efforts were made to overcome this failure. There's no documentation of others who might have been involved in the transition and what their roles were. The order of parole conditions is general and not tailored to the offender's needs, nor are incentives for positive behavior built into the order.	
I. C. 1. The Community Counselor supports the family towards the youth's re-entry.	Standard not met. Several attempts were made by JRA staff but Youth #1's family was uncooperative.	Standard not met
I. C. 2. The Community Counselor works in conjunction with residential staff, family, relatives and or the local Division of Children and Family Services in the development of a transition plan.	Standard met	Standard not met;
I. C. 3. The Community Counselor meets in person with the youth at least once during the 90 days that precede release.	Standard met	Standard not met
I. C. 4. The initial release contact between the youth and his/her Community Counselor or designee occurs within three working days after release to intensive parole and includes review and amendment, if necessary, of the initial order of parole conditions.	Standard not met; the meeting occurred seven days after release from Maple Lane.	Standard met

Standard	Youth #1	Youth #2
I. D. COMMUNITY CASE RESPONSIBILITIES	--	--
Purpose: To provide interventions designed to reduce the likelihood of further offense behavior and to enhance the youth's competencies. The focus is on youth competency development and accountability to enhance community protection.	--	--
I. D. 1. Duration of Intensive Parole Supervision is a minimum of 12 weeks for Basic Training Residential Program and 26 weeks for all others	Standard met	Standard not met;
I. D. 2. Nature and frequency of IP Program Standards	Not applicable	Not applicable
I. D. 2. a) 1. Participation in individualized and intensive programming, e.g., 30 hours/week (school, work, community service, day reporting, treatment groups, and activities) intended to facilitate reintegration and rehabilitation.	Standard not met. Information was provided by JRA, but Youth #1 did not follow through. No sanction and no treatment were provided.	Standard not met
I. D. 2. a) 2. Participation in treatment/competency development program	Standard not met Information was provided however Youth #1 did not follow through. No sanction and no treatment were provided.	Record unclear
I. D. 2. a) 3. Incentive programming and graduated sanctions	Standard not met; no evidence that graduated sanctions were considered or used.	Record unclear
I. D. 2. a) 4. Mandatory curfew with approved exceptions, e.g., non-standard work schedule.	The curfew was imposed but not followed. There was no sanction for failure to comply.	Standard not met; no sanction for repeated violation.
I. D. 2. a) 5. Electronic Surveillance or, if not feasible, other daily curfew monitoring - - mandatory during the first 15 days.	Standard not met. Electronic monitoring was ordered but never implemented for Youth #1.	Standard not met; never placed on electronic monitoring.
Nature and frequency of IP Supervision Contacts and Attempts	--	--
I. D. 2. a) 1. JRCC - - once per week with youth. Half the monthly contacts in the field. A designee may make contact in the absence of the JRCC.	Standard met. Contact was made until Youth #1 absconded from supervision.	Standard met
I. D. 2. a) 2. JRCC - - three times a month contact with family or responsible adult (at least one contact should be in person).	Standard met	Standard not met despite repeated attempts by the Community Counselor.
I. D. 2. a) 3. JRCC or JRC - weekly contact with one or more service providers, in person staffing as necessary to enhance youth response to services.	Standard not met; no service providers were identified in the plan.	Standard not met.
I. D. 2. a) 4. JRCA - - four to ten times a month in person whereabouts verification in the field based on individualized case management and supervision needs.	Standard met	Record unclear
I. D. 2. b) and c) Phases II and III	Not applicable. Youth #1 never graduated beyond Phase One.	Not applicable
I. D. 3 (none)	--	--

Standard	Youth #1	Youth #2
I. D. 4. Movement between phases	Not applicable. Verification occurred or was attempted until Youth #1 absconded from supervision.	Not applicable
I. D. 5. A warrant for arrest is completed and submitted by the Community Counselor within five (5) working days of having reason to believe a youth is Whereabouts Unknown.	Standard met	Standard met
I. D. 6. (none)	--	--
I. D. 7. and 8. Suspension of Parole and Parole Discharge	Not applicable	Not applicable
I. E. 1. Parole revocations follow the WAC	Standard met	Not Applicable
I. E. 2. Revocation planning occurs with a Program Manager or Administrator.	Standard met	Not Applicable
	Not applicable	Not applicable
I. F. Discharge		
I. Exceptions to Intensive Parole Standards A written request for waiver of these standards is sent to the Regional Administrator when the application of these standards can be shown to be detrimental or impractical to specific case needs or overall program operations. A written copy of any waiver approved by the Regional Administrator is sent to the Director of Community Programs and Parole Program Administrator. The Parole Program Administrator will track trends and patterns of exceptions.	Standard not met	Standard not met

WASHINGTON STATE OFFICE OF FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT
INSURANCE BUILDING ◆ PO BOX 43113
OLYMPIA, WA 98504-3113 ◆ (360) 902-0555 ◆ FAX (360) 664-2832