



Report to the Washington State Legislature
JUVENILE COURT BLOCK GRANT

RCW 13.40.540



Washington State Department of
CHILDREN, YOUTH & FAMILIES

If you would like copies of this document in an alternative format or language, please contact DCYF Constituent Relations (1-800-723-4831 | 360-902-8060, ConstRelations@dcyf.wa.gov).

Original Date: Oct. 17, 2022

Juvenile Rehabilitation | Approved for distribution by Felice Upton, Assistant Secretary of Juvenile Rehabilitation



Washington State Department of
CHILDREN, YOUTH & FAMILIES

CONTENTS

Executive Summary.....2

Introduction.....3

Background.....3

 State and Local Partnership.....4

 Quality Assurance and Structure Oversight.....4

Programs and Services.....4

 Case Management Assessment Process.....4

 Disposition Alternatives.....6

 Disposition Alternative Starts.....6

 Disposition Alternatives Expenditures.....8

Evidence-Based Programs.....9

Promising Programs.....10

Quality Assurance to Maintain Rigorous Program Standards.....11

 Coordination of Services Program.....11

 Education Employment Training Program.....12

 Functional Family Therapy Program.....13

 Multi-Systemic Therapy Program.....15

Evidence-Based Program Participation Tracking.....15

Evidence-Based Program Eligibility.....15

Evidence-Based Program Starts.....18

Evidence-Based Program Successful Completes.....21

Eligible for an Evidence-Based Program but Did Not Start.....24

Started an Evidence-Based Program but Did Not Complete.....24

Evidence-Based Program Expenditures.....25

Promising Programs Starts.....26

Promising Program Expenditures.....26

Referred Youth.....26

 County-by-County Description of Juvenile Court Referred Youth.....27

Indian Tribal Evidence-Based Programs.....27

Juvenile Court Evidence-Based Program Map.....29

List of Acronyms and Terms.....30

 Appendix A.....30

In Collaboration With
Washington Association of Juvenile Court Administrators
Administrative Office of the Courts
Washington State Center for Court Research

Original Date: Oct. 17, 2022

Juvenile Rehabilitation | Approved for distribution by Felice Upton, Assistant Secretary of Juvenile Rehabilitation

Executive Summary

The state and juvenile courts have a long-standing partnership founded on the commitment to reduce the number of youth and young adults in the juvenile justice system, many of whom are young people of color, and the overall reliance on state institution programs. The Washington State Department of Children, Youth, and Families (DCYF) recognizes the racism inherent in the juvenile justice system. As noted in DCYF's Strategic Priorities 2021-2026:

Racism has shaped policies, practices, culture, and systems, including approaches to early childhood, child welfare, and juvenile justice... The overrepresentation of youth and young adults of color in juvenile rehabilitation is the result of the many inequities that impact BIPOC (Black, Indigenous, and People of Color) communities, such as food and housing insecurity, under-funded schools, disciplinary policies, and over-policing. Young people who end up in the juvenile justice system are often acting out of survival or coping with the traumatic and toxic stress in their environment.

DCYF remains committed to addressing inherent systematic racism, eliminating racial disproportionalities, and advancing racial equity by becoming an anti-racist organization, implementing liberatory, human-centered, and healing-centered design across DCYF, and ensuring assessments and programs are equitable across the agency.

The partnership between the state and juvenile courts includes funding for local juvenile court programs that are effective at reducing juvenile criminal behavior. This collaborative effort has moved through various iterations to include probation subsidies, grants for effective programs, disposition alternative programs for committable youth, and a statewide application of evidence-based programs (EBPs). In 2009, the Legislature required that all state dollars passed to local juvenile courts by DCYF's Juvenile Rehabilitation (JR) be administered as a block grant. Priority of this particular block grant is to be given to EBPs and disposition alternatives diverting youth from confinement in JR.

The block grant is a way of funding juvenile courts for local flexibility to meet the needs of low, moderate, and high-risk youth, while also improving public safety and maximizing savings to the state and local communities. The Block Grant Funding Formula provides financial incentive to courts who deliver programs that have demonstrated effectiveness and divert committable youth from state institution beds.

The following are highlights of the block grant implementation:

- Continued implementation of a funding formula that provides fiscal incentive for juvenile courts that deliver EBPs and disposition alternatives.
- Increased partnership through the ongoing efforts of a joint oversight committee that is focused on using data to assess the implementation of the funding formula.
- The addition of promising programs that have been approved through the Community Juvenile Accountability Act (CJAA) Advisory Committee's established approval protocols.
- It is clear the COVID-19 pandemic has affected the implementation of services in the juvenile courts. This is evident by the continued reduction of services provided this past fiscal year (2022).

These highlights indicate the state's investment in and partnership with the juvenile courts and their programs. The shift to block grant funding continues to reinforce positive outcomes, which suggests that

probation and the use of disposition alternatives and EBPs continue to reduce juvenile offender risk to our communities. This contributes to a healthier and safer Washington State.

Introduction

In accordance with RCW [13.06.020](#), the state appropriates approximately \$38 million to local county juvenile courts each two-year budget cycle. In order to reduce reliance on state-operated institutions, this funding provides community-based responses for youth who commit crimes. The funding also assists with the application of disposition (sentencing) programs. DCYF's JR program administers these dollars across the 33 county juvenile court jurisdictions.

This block grant report, which was prepared pursuant to RCW [13.40.540](#)(3), includes the following:

- Descriptions of the programs funded within the block grant.
- Evidence-based and promising program outputs.
- Disposition alternatives outputs.
- Quality assurance (QA) results.
- Program cost information.

Background

In Washington, a person under 18 years of age who commits a criminal offense is subject to the state's juvenile justice laws. These laws have changed significantly over the years, and since 1977, Washington has had a juvenile sentencing system that is unique among the 50 states. Unlike all other states, Washington has a form of "semi-determinate" sentencing for juvenile offenders. The standard range sentence a juvenile offender may receive is determined by a juvenile court judge after required review of various factors (RCW 13.40.150) before considering five sentencing options (RCW 13.40.0357) reflected in a statewide "grid" that includes age at offense, the severity of the current offense, and prior criminal history. While the Washington State Sentencing Guidelines Commission has the authority to consider and recommend changes to the juvenile sentencing system, the Legislature formally adopts the grid that Washington judges use as guidance to provide disposition to juvenile offenses. In all other states, local courts have discretion in how to sentence juveniles. Washington is unique in that the Legislature limits local sentencing discretion.

The operation of the juvenile justice system involves both state and local governments. Under Washington's juvenile sentencing grid, the most serious juvenile offenders are subject to incarceration in state institutions managed by JR. After serving a JR sentence, the most serious offenders are placed on parole (post-commitment community aftercare supervision).

Washington's sentencing grid places less serious juvenile offenders under the jurisdiction of the county juvenile courts. These juveniles may receive less than 30 days in detention and a sentence of probation (community supervision). In addition to detention and probation, many minor first-time offenders are placed in juvenile court diversion programs, often with the assistance of a community accountability board (13.40.070).

County juvenile courts perform other functions in addition to those relating to juvenile offenders. In particular, the courts implement state laws on child dependency, as well as at-risk, runaway, and truant youth.

State and Local Partnership

Washington State has recognized and accepted that the responsibility for offender youth resides in executive and judicial branches of government as reflected in the Consolidated Juvenile Services statute (13.06.030) with the Washington State juvenile courts. Payments of state funds to counties were provided for special juvenile court probation supervision programs in order to meet legislative intentions, including reducing the necessity for commitment of juveniles to state juvenile correctional institutions and improving supervision of juveniles placed on probation by the juvenile courts. This has been referred to as a Probation Subsidy (Washington Laws, Chapter 165, Laws of 1969).

The Legislature has continued to build on the state and local partnership throughout the years by adding additional programs and funding. The focus of the programs continues to be reducing commitments to the state by providing resources to local counties for the provision of programs and services that reduce the further reliance on the state's juvenile justice system.

Quality Assurance and Structure Oversight

The Washington Association of Juvenile Court Administrators (WAJCA) and JR have developed a statewide-centralized QA structure. This partnership has led to a strong commitment to evidence and research-based model fidelity. Both WAJCA and JR allocate funds to a comprehensive QA system that addresses the unique needs of each of the programs.

The success of EBPs is dependent upon a solid infrastructure. Funded by the state, WAJCA developed a statewide Case Management and Assessment Process (CMAP) coordinator position. In addition to the collaborative QA structure, the juvenile courts and JR work together at both the local and statewide level to ensure programs are being implemented as designed. The JR central office provides fiscal and contract management oversight to these programs across the state. JR regional offices are located across the state and work with individual courts regarding billing and program reporting information. JR also provides program development, oversight, and support to all the juvenile courts on an as-needed basis from a centralized headquarters location.

In 2009, the state gradually reduced funding for these programs commensurate with decreasing state revenue. These reductions have impacted the number of state-funded juvenile court programs that are being delivered. Additionally, the counties have also had to contend with reductions in local funding. In spite of these fiscal tensions, the juvenile courts have continued to prioritize the delivery of EBPs and disposition alternatives.

Programs and Services

Case Management Assessment Process

CMAP emerged in response to the CJAA, enacted by the Washington State Legislature in 1997. The legislative intent was to fund empirically validated programs to reduce recidivism. The WAJCA, comprised of 33 juvenile court jurisdictions, led this effort. In conjunction with the Washington State Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP), an innovative risk and needs assessment tool was developed: the Washington State Juvenile Court Assessment (WSJCA). Minor revisions have been made over the years. The current risk/needs assessment used today is the Positive Achievement Change Tool (PACT), which is based on the WSJCA. Through research by Washington State University, the PACT instrument is being updated to more accurately predict risk and identify criminogenic needs to address in case management. The instrument is called the Juvenile Court Assessment

Tool (JCAT). The Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) is building the software for the instrument, which should be implemented and used by the juvenile courts in the near future.

In addition to meeting the legislative funding requirement, WAJCA envisioned an offender case management process that would best use the information gathered from the assessment. In 1998, WAJCA created the Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) to establish QA standards. The QAC was also responsible for developing an effective process for adhering to the Risk/Need/Responsivity Principle (RNR). In 2000, QAC proposed to WAJCA the CMAP as the model for community supervision. CMAP intends to accomplish the following:

- Determine a youth’s level of risk to re-offend as a means to target resources at those presenting as higher risk (Risk).
- Identify dynamic risk factors that are directly linked to the youth’s criminal behavior (Criminogenic Need).
- Identify dynamic protective factors that can help strengthen pro-social behavior.
- Match youth to the appropriate intervention designed specifically to address the youth’s Criminogenic Need (Responsivity).
- Develop outcome measures to determine if targeted factors change as a result of the intervention.

CMAP is a four-step model followed by all juvenile courts in Washington State:

1. Mapping: “Discovery” – administer a risk and needs assessment and build rapport to elicit valid and reliable information, process case, and map results.
2. Finding the Hook: “Motivation” – while using Motivational Interviewing (MI) approach, work with the youth and family on identifying target behavior, goals, and action steps.
3. Moving Forward: “Intervention” – provide youth with opportunities to change behavior by building pro-social skills and new ways of thinking to increase self-efficacy through evidence-based programming while assessing for readiness, importance, and confidence.
4. Reviewing and Supporting: “Monitor Progress” – increase incentives, remove obstacles, provide reinforcement, teach maintenance strategies, and reassess for change.

Every Juvenile Probation Counselor (JPC) must attend an initial 40-hour CMAP training and be certified at least every four years. Ongoing training and technical assistance are provided to each county. A number of QA methods are in place to ensure model fidelity and proper implementation of CMAP:

- State QAC.
- State CMAP QA policies.
- State CMAP coordinator.
- Certified state trainers.
- Certified Quality Assurance Specialists (QAS) – each county has its own QAS to ensure model fidelity.
- Local Quality Assurance Plan (QAP) – each county is required to have a written plan for the implementation of CMAP at the local level.
- Environmental assessment – to assess the quality of CMAP implementation through regular site visits where interviews and survey data are collected from juvenile court management, staff, and youth.

Disposition Alternatives

Youth who would otherwise be committed to JR may be eligible for a disposition alternative that allows them to remain in the community and receive local services and supervision through the juvenile court. Each of the following alternatives has specific eligibility criteria and is generally designed to serve youth with specific, identifiable treatment needs who have also been identified as amenable to treatment in a community setting.

Effective July 1, 2016, the Legislature combined the Chemical Dependency and Mental Health Disposition Alternatives into one – Chemical Dependency Mental Health Disposition Alternative (CDMHDA). This disposition alternative provides treatment tracks for chemical dependency, mental health, and co-occurring. For the purposes of this report, all treatment track expenditures are totaled as one amount.

Chemical Dependency Mental Health Disposition Alternative (CDMHDA) – RCW 13.40.165

In 1997, the state Legislature passed the Chemical Dependency Disposition Alternative (CDDA) with the intention to provide a local supervision and treatment option for youth that would otherwise be institutionalized with the state (CDDA Committable). In an effort to reach more youth with substance use issues, the statute was later amended to include a provision for locally sanctioned youth to receive this disposition. The local sanction option serves the vast majority of youth in this disposition. In July 2016, the state Legislature repealed the Mental Health Disposition Alternative (RCW 13.40.167) and included a mental health and co-occurring provision into CDDA.

Special Sex Offender Disposition Alternative (SSODA) – RCW 13.40.160

In 1990, the SSODA was passed. This disposition provides funding to local juvenile courts to maintain eligible youth that have sexually offended, utilizing local probation and treatment services.

Suspended Disposition Alternative (SDA) – RCW 13.40.0357

In 2005, the Legislature passed the SDA. This disposition intends to keep youth who would otherwise be institutionalized by the state under the supervision of the local juvenile courts. This program includes a provision and funding for evidence-based programming and supervision. This option is for committable youth who do not meet eligibility requirements for the other disposition alternatives.

Disposition Alternative Starts

Table 1: Starts in state fiscal year (SFY) 2022

Disposition Alternative	Count (N)
Chemical Dependency Mental Health Disposition Alternative (CDMHDA)	
Chemical Dependency	31
Mental Health	18
Co-Occurring	29
Special Sex Offender Disposition Alternative (SSODA)	131
Suspended Disposition Alternative (SDA)	34
Totals	243

Table 1 represents the number of juvenile court youth who started each program during SFY 2022, July 1, 2021, - June 30, 2022.

JUVENILE COURT BLOCK GRANT

Table 2: Program starts in SFY 2022 by gender

Gender	Number and percent of starts by gender	Disposition Alternative					Totals
		CDMHDA Chemical Dependency	CDMHDA Mental Health	CDMHDA Co-Occurring	SSODA	SDA	
Female	Number	6	7	11	3	4	31
	Percent	19.4	38.9	37.9	2.3	11.8	12.8
Male	Number	25	11	18	128	30	212
	Percent	80.6	61.1	62.1	97.7	88.2	87.2
Total	Number	31	18	29	131	34	243
	Percent	100	100	100	100	100	100

Table 3: Program starts in SFY 2022 by race

Race	Number and percent of starts by race	Disposition Alternative					Totals
		CDMHDA Chemical Dependency	CDMHDA Mental Health	CDMHDA Co-Occurring	SSODA	SDA	
Other / Unknown	Number	3	0	0	3	0	6
	Percent	9.7	0.0	0.0	2.3	0.0	2.5
White	Number	12	9	9	73	5	108
	Percent	38.7	50.0	31.1	55.7	14.7	44.5
Black / African American	Number	9	2	11	10	12	44
	Percent	29.0	11.0	37.9	7.6	35.4	18.1
American Indian / Alaskan Native	Number	1	1	0	2	6	10
	Percent	3.2	5.6	0.0	1.5	17.6	4.1
Asian	Number	0	1	4	5	1	11
	Percent	0.0	5.6	13.8	3.8	2.9	4.5
Hispanic / Latino	Number	1	3	1	15	1	21
	Percent	3.2	16.6	3.4	11.5	2.9	8.6
Two or More	Number	2	1	4	8	4	19
	Percent	6.5	5.6	13.8	6.1	11.8	7.8
Unreported	Number	3	1	0	15	5	24
	Percent	9.7	5.6	0.0	11.5	14.7	9.9
Total	Number	31	18	29	131	34	243
	Percent	100	100	100	100	100	100


Table 4 and Figure 1 (below) provide information on disposition alternative starters from SFY 2017-2021. Since 2017, the overall number of disposition starters has declined, with CDMHDA seeing the sharpest decline. However, SSODA has been relatively stable since 2017, and SDA had a large increase in 2019. The decline in overall numbers in 2020 and 2021 can be attributed, in large part, to COVID-19.

JUVENILE COURT BLOCK GRANT

Table 4: Historical starts in SFY 2017-2021

DA	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	Total
CDMHDA	366	311	248	175	105	1,205
SSODA	108	117	119	83	134	561
SDA	31	29	60	63	74	257
Total	505	457	427	321	313	2,023

Figure 1: Starts for state fiscal year 2017-2021



Disposition Alternatives Expenditures

Table 5: Disposition alternative expenditures for SFY 2022¹

Programs	CDMHDA	SSODA	SDA	Total
Costs	\$662,937	\$2,276,895	\$101,463	\$3,041,295

Table 5 represents program expenditure information as reported by the juvenile courts to JR for SFY 2022, July 1, 2021 – June 30, 2022. Three-quarters of disposition alternative dollars (75%) were spent on SSODA in SFY 2022.


Table 6 and Figure 2 provide information on disposition alternative expenditures from SFY 2017-2021. Overall expenditures have been relatively stable, ranging from \$3.7 million in 2017 down to \$3.4 million in 2021.

Table 6: Expenditures for SFY 2017-2021

DA	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
CDMHDA	\$1,366,741	\$1,355,238	\$1,221,567	\$1,325,613	\$969,282
SSODA	\$2,185,428	\$2,204,415	\$2,266,469	\$2,307,710	\$2,267,562
SDA	\$153,211	\$86,294	\$100,800	\$51,741	\$142,747
Total	\$3,705,380	\$3,645,947	\$3,588,836	\$3,685,064	\$3,379,591

¹ Expenditure information includes data as of August 26, 2022.

Figure 2: Expenditures for SFY 2016-2020



Evidence-Based Programs

The CJAA was included in Washington Laws Chapter 338, Laws of 1997, as an incentive to local communities to implement cost-effective interventions to reduce recidivism among juvenile offenders. The CJAA’s primary purpose is to “provide a continuum of community-based programs that emphasize a juvenile offender’s accountability for his or her actions while assisting him or her in the development of skills necessary to function effectively and positively in the community in a manner consistent with public safety (RCW 13.40.500).”

Drawing on program evaluations and meta-analyses, WSIPP, in collaboration with WAJCA and JR, identified a range of effective approaches that could cost-effectively reduce juvenile offender recidivism. Four programs were identified in 1998 for implementation in Washington State. Since then, a fifth (FIT, 2008) and sixth (EET, 2015) program were added to the list of options:

- Washington State Aggression Replacement Training (WSART)
- Coordination of Services (COS)
- Education and Employment Training (EET)
- Functional Family Therapy (FFT)
- Family Integrated Transitions (FIT)
- Multi-Systemic Therapy (MST)

At the direction of the Legislature, WSIPP completed a comprehensive evaluation of the original four (WSART, COS, FFT, and MST) CJAA programs. Analysis of program and control groups occurred at six, 12, and 18 months (preliminary information was released on WSART in June 2002 and on FFT in August 2002). In January 2004, WSIPP released its final report, Outcome Evaluation of Washington State’s Research-Based Programs for Juvenile Offenders. Their data reflected the CJAA program’s positive impact on felony recidivism. The report provided data on cost-effectiveness as well as competent versus non-competent delivery of each CJAA program. The report also recommended an improved form of quality control to ensure cost-beneficial reductions in recidivism. In response to this recommendation, the CJAA Advisory Committee developed an enhanced QA process, explained in more detail in the COS, EET, and FFT sections of this report. To read the full report, visit www.wsipp.wa.gov.

The WSIPP published Quality Control Standard: Washington State Research-Based Juvenile Offender Programs, which details recommendations for QA plans for research-based interventions. The enhanced QA plans for the CJAA programs comply with the standards in WSIPP’s report. Additional data has been added to the QA sections of this report to meet the 2003 recommendations.

In 2005, the Legislature directed WSIPP to report whether evidence-based and cost-beneficial policy options exist in lieu of building two new prisons by 2020, and possibly another prison by 2030. In October 2006, WSIPP published Evidence-Based Public Policy Options to Reduce Future Prison Construction, Criminal Justice Costs, and Crime Rates. The report stated that if Washington can successfully implement a moderate to aggressive portfolio of evidence-based options, then a significant level of prison construction can be avoided, saving state and local tax payers about \$2 billion, and slightly lowering net crime rates. CJAA EBP implementation plays a key role in helping to meet these desired outcomes. This report was a key driver for Legislature approving significant fund increases for EBPs delivered by the county juvenile courts. This new funding was implemented through a grant program during SFY 2008 and is known as Evidence-Based Expansion.

In 2009, the Legislature directed WSIPP to “conduct an analysis of the costs per participant of EBPs by the juvenile courts.” The WSIPP worked with the CJAA Advisory Committee, WAJCA, JR, and the AOC to determine the requirements for delivering these programs. The WSIPP published its report in December 2009, which produced new average costs per participant that are more representative of delivering EBPs in juvenile court settings today. To read the full report, visit www.wsipp.wa.gov.

In 2019, WSIPP conducted an outcome evaluation on the Juvenile Court’s WSART program. The evaluation concluded that WSART participants were more likely to recidivate than similar youth who did not participate in WSART. As a result, WSART lost its research-based classification and the ability for the juvenile courts to use state funding to provide this program. To conclude the phase-out process, WAJCA stopped implementing WSART as of July 1, 2021.

Promising Programs

The WSIPP identified “promising practices” as programs that show promising results, but require further evaluation to determine whether they can be considered evidence-based. Guidelines to determine promising programs have been developed by the CJAA Advisory Committee. An important element of these guidelines is program evaluation. When a promising program is evaluated and produces evidence of reduced recidivism, and has a cost benefit to taxpayers, the program can be reclassified as an evidence-based or research-based program. Thus, the program becomes eligible for consideration as a CJAA program. Programs can only be considered “promising” by the CJAA Advisory Committee.

As of the end of SFY 2022, there are two promising programs approved by the CJAA Advisory Committee. The first is the Individual – Alternative Choice Training (i-ACT) program designed to be used individually with youth and address criminogenic needs using current researched-based practices and Cognitive Behavioral Treatment (CBT). The second promising program, approved in June 2021, is the Team – Alternative Choice Training (Team-ACT), which is designed to co-exist with i-ACT, but targets small groups of youth (two to three) with similar risk factors.

Table 7: Program availability

JUVENILE COURT BLOCK GRANT

Type of Program	Number of Courts
Evidence-based programs	
Coordination of Services (COS)	13
Employment Education Training (EET)	14
Functional Family Therapy (FFT)	24
Family Integrated Transitions (FIT)	0
Multi-Systemic Therapy (MST)	4
Promising programs	
Individual – Alternative Choice Training (i–ACT)	28
Team – Alternative Choice Training (Team–ACT)	1

Table 7 represents the number of juvenile courts across the state that delivered specific evidence-based and promising programs in SFY 2022, July 1, 2021 - June 30, 2022.

Quality Assurance to Maintain Rigorous Program Standards

CJAA was the first ongoing effort in the nation to replicate effective interventions on a statewide basis. To ensure program integrity, meet evaluation standards, and continuously identify and resolve program issues, all programs now have mandatory QA measures as recommended by WSIPP’s 2003 report – **Recommended Quality Control Standards**. The following information outlines the program standards for the four EBPs.

Coordination of Services Program

The Washington State COS is a 12-hour seminar, attended by a youth and parent or connected adult. The seminar consists of five to eight interactive sessions presented by community organizations or individuals who have a passion for working with families. The session facilitators offer interactive lessons that educate and teach participants about adolescent development, building relationships, decision-making, boundaries, accountability, communication, and conflict resolution, while developing community connections.

The specific objectives of the program are to improve family relations, enhance youth strengths, build healthy relationships, and offer access to valuable services in their community. The COS program uses a small group based learning model in conjunction with the principles of Popular Education. This program can successfully be implemented in rural, suburban, and urban settings.

The WSIPP completed a second evaluation on COS in September 2015. The second evaluation was completed in response to program expansion and QA implementation in 2010. This [evaluation](#) reported that COS reduced recidivism by about 3.5 percentage points (from 20% to 16.5%) and was found to be a research-based program. In January 2020, WSIPP published [Updated Evidence Classifications for Select State - Funded Juvenile Justice Programs in Washington State: A Resource Guide](#), which upgraded the COS program classification from research-based to evidence-based.

During SFY 2022, 13 counties provided the COS program. Throughout the year, the state QAS provided QA oversight and ongoing consultation to existing programs and supported the new courts with implementation efforts.

The following occurred in SFY 2022:

- Of the 13 courts providing COS, six contract with a provider and eight utilize juvenile court staff to deliver the program.
- In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, virtual COS program standards were created and implemented in May 2020. During SFY 2022, 12 courts were able to provide virtual programming to youth and families in their respective jurisdictions. As the pandemic restrictions lifted, seven courts resumed in-person programming. The state QAS was able to observe all 12 court programs virtually to ensure continued program fidelity and to help support virtual programming efforts across the state.
- Using the newly developed COS Program Evaluation tool, formal program evaluations began in February 2022. As of July 2022, five courts have received a program evaluation and all five performed within fidelity and competency standards.
- The way we collect and track data statewide has been improved to reflect program dosage and specific core session content for each jurisdiction. Improving our data collecting methods will aid in future program research.
- Annual COS training was held in person for the first time since the start of the pandemic. This year, we contracted with Marli Williams LLC, a Master Facilitator, Leadership Trainer, and Engagement Strategist. She trained our staff on designing and delivering highly interactive and engaging sessions and workshops.
- Despite experiencing a very challenging year, COS program facilitators remained dedicated to serving the youth and families in their communities by being flexible, innovative, and open to providing virtual programming. During the last two years of the pandemic 656 (93%) youth successfully completed COS.

Education Employment Training Program

The EET program incorporates best practice approaches to reduce risk factors and increase protective factors associated with the school and employment domains as measured by the PACT. The EET program also promotes restorative justice by creating opportunities for youth involved in the juvenile justice system to make victim restitution and serve the community through service learning projects. By addressing these factors, the EET program seeks to reduce recidivism for moderate and high-risk youth.

EET is a collaborative education and workforce development program for moderate and high-risk youth involved in the juvenile justice system. The program is comprised of a continuum of educational supports, employment development, and community-based developmental activities that are focused to impact specific dynamic risk and protective factors. The program's education component supports school engagement through individual Youth Goal and Support Services (YGSS), assessment, and incentives for educational engagement and achievement. Employment training services include assessment, job readiness/job retention skills training, vocational counseling, linkage to appropriate community-based workforce development programming, job shadowing, career exploration, and meaningful paid work experience. In addition, the program supports use of free time activities and promotes compliance with court-ordered obligations by assisting youth to comply with legal financial obligations through earning stipends for skill development, community restoration projects, and paid work training internships.

The program incorporates partnerships with the local business community and leadership organizations to offer relevant experiences and internships engaging youth with employers as mentors. Another key element of the program is to identify, support, and recognize milestones in individual youth development that will

impact the identified risk and protective factors. The program has now been implemented statewide. Currently, EET is offered in 14 counties, with one more expecting to implement in SFY 2023.

The WSIPP completed research on EET as delivered by King County in December 2015. This [evaluation](#) reported that EET reduced overall recidivism by 12 percentage points from 51% to 39% compared to youth who participated in typical juvenile court programs. WSIPP estimated EET produces \$34 in benefit per \$1 of costs.

The EET QA process was developed and implemented statewide on April 2019. Under the current QA Plan, a full-time statewide QAS oversees the program and provides direct consultation to the program’s education and employment specialists. Additionally, the QAS provides consultation to courts interested in offering this program, to help support implementation efforts.

The following occurred in SFY 2022:

- To improve program data collection, in October 2021, a new Access database was operationalized and each jurisdiction with an active program received an individual database. How we collect data will not only assist researchers in determining the future outcomes of EET, but it will also assist in the QA and quality improvement of the program.
- In June 2022, in collaboration with JR’s EET program, a joint EET training was conducted with all county programs and JR’s EET staff. The training directly related to job readiness, financial literacy, education reengagement, and networking opportunities for both JR and local county EET programs.
- In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, virtual EET program standards were created and implemented in May 2020. During SFY 2022, the majority of the programs provided a “hybrid” of virtual and in-person programming. The state QAS consulted regularly with program staff to help support virtual programming efforts across the state.
- Despite experiencing a very challenging year, EET program facilitators remained dedicated to serving the youth in their communities by being flexible, innovative, and open to providing virtual programming. During the last two years of the pandemic, 221 (51%) youth successfully completed EET.
- An EET Program Evaluation Tool has been developed and will be operationalized in SFY 2023.

Functional Family Therapy Program

FFT is a family-based service conducted for an average of 12-14 sessions over three to four months. The program emphasizes engaging and motivating families to achieve specific and obtainable change-related goals and behaviors, to reduce criminal behavior.

The Washington State Center for Court Research (WSCCR) completed a study on FFT in August 2016. The study showed mixed results regarding recidivism. There was significant reduction in recidivism for those that completed FFT compared to those that started and did not complete the intervention. The study did not find other statistically significant changes. Over the next year, the FFT Project will work with FFT LLC, FFT clinical

supervisors, the courts, and service providers to continue to enhance efforts to deliver greater quality services based on the recommendations of the study. Additionally, the FFT Project is committed to providing model fidelity services to the youth and families served and the policymakers and taxpayers who fund the program. Finally, WSIPP's most recent reports concluded that FFT has the second-best benefit-cost ratio (\$8.94:\$1) among programs for juvenile probationers.

Twenty-four juvenile courts across Washington State provide FFT as a CJAA program. This service is provided in demographically diverse locations: inner cities, suburbs, remote/rural areas, and regions centered on medium-sized communities. With the ongoing need of a large-scale multi-site implementation, JR provides statewide QA, oversight of all trainings, and model fidelity for the FFT program. JR and WAJCA work collaboratively to develop the funding and oversight for these QA functions.

The FFT therapists are either juvenile court service employees or contracted service providers. In nine of the juvenile courts, a single therapist provides the FFT model in the community service area.

Washington State has six trained FFT clinical supervisors who provide the therapists with clinical consultation, support, and accountability. All FFT therapists receive ongoing training on the practical application of this rigorous and complex intervention.

FFT therapists are assessed for clinical adherence and fidelity to the FFT model through weekly clinical consultations, therapist evaluations, and training sessions. The clinical assessments provide the therapists with ongoing feedback that will ultimately improve services as outlined in the Washington State FFT Project QA and Improvement Plan.

FFT LLC and the Washington State FFT Project continue to recognize the importance of providing additional clinical consultation, training, and guidelines to support the therapist delivering the FFT intervention via online or remote platforms. In our efforts, the FFT Project was successful in providing the therapists with new tools and resources to ensure the families were receiving the service with model fidelity.

FFT LLC's implementation of a new Clinical Service System (CSS), an electronic clinical database the therapists use in their FFT practice, has proven beneficial in monitoring and supporting the clinical practice of the FFT therapists. The CSS is a vital tool therapists use to learn the FFT model phase goals and techniques. It is essential for documentation of session progress notes, session plans, assessments, and contacts with the referral source. The FFT clinical supervisors use the CSS to monitor the therapist's practice to ensure model fidelity. The FFT Project will continue to use the CSS to track outcomes and progress and use the data for QA and quality improvement in the implementation and service of the FFT model.

The following results were attained for SFY Year 2022:

- New therapists receive performance reviews every 30 days, for three months, which include dissemination adherence, meeting caseload requirement, and attendance/participation in weekly clinical consultation with their team.
- Therapists receive a performance review, which includes a global therapist rating and clinical feedback every 90-120 days.
- Statewide average fidelity rating was **5.8** (exceeding the goal of 3).

- Statewide average dissemination adherence rating was **5.8** (exceeding the goal of 4).
- **1** therapist received a corrective action plan (Improvement Plan).
- **30** therapists delivered the intervention in the juvenile courts.
- **7** new therapists were trained.

Multi-Systemic Therapy Program

MST is a family intervention conducted for an average of four months. MST targets specific youth and environmental factors that contribute to anti-social behavior. MST is typically provided in the home. Therapists, who have very small caseloads (four to six), are available 24 hours a day, seven days a week. State dollars are currently funding sites in King, Snohomish, Yakima, and Benton/Franklin Counties.

MST services is conducting close oversight of MST implementation. Initial and ongoing training, site visits, and clinical consultation are provided. Ongoing training, consultation, and oversight from MST services continue through block grant funds to maintain the Washington State program as a certified MST site.

MST teams are organized around a doctoral-level practitioner who has on-site clinical oversight of a group of masters-level therapists. Therapists receive weekly clinical consultations through MST services.

Evidence-Based Program Participation Tracking

EBP numbers reported throughout this document come to JR from juvenile court reporting and directly from the Washington State Juvenile Court Risk Assessment as they were entered online by juvenile probation staff. The juvenile court risk assessment data was extracted by the WSCCR and, as part of ongoing QA, reviewed and revised at the court level in preparation for this report. All results are presented at the state level.

Evidence-Based Program Eligibility

Eligibility for an EBP is determined by two factors:

1. Risk level as determined by the PACT assessment. The PACT is a 126-item, multiple-choice assessment instrument which produces risk-level scores measuring a juvenile’s risk of re-offending.²
2. The program is offered in the county where the youth receives services.

A youth may meet the risk-level eligibility criteria for an EBP, but because the EBP is not offered where they are supervised by juvenile probation, they are not counted as eligible (i.e., eligibility indicates both eligibility as determined through the assessment tool and the availability of the EBP in the county where the youth is served). Youth who are low-risk are generally considered eligible for only one EBP – COS. Youth who are determined moderate or high-risk may be eligible for one or more of the following programs: COS, EET, FFT, and MST.

During fiscal year 2022, there were 2,953 instances of eligibility for EBPs across the state. A youth may become eligible for the same program on more than one occasion if they served more than one probation term within the fiscal year. The small numbers for FIT and MST eligibilities are because the programs are offered in a very limited number of counties, and these programs are targeted at a narrowly defined group of juvenile offenders with multi-faceted needs.

² Find additional information on the PACT assessment tool at http://www.assessments.com/catalog/PACT_Full_Assessment.htm

JUVENILE COURT BLOCK GRANT

Table 8: Total number of eligibilities in FY 2022

Program	Frequency	Percent of All Eligibilities
COS	1,072	36.3%
EET	679	23.0%
FFT	868	29.4%
FIT	106	3.6%
MST	228	7.7%
All Eligibilities	2,953	100.00%

Table 9 demonstrates the proportion of females and males who are eligible for each EBP.

Table 9: Program eligibility in FY 2022 by gender

Gender	Number and Percent of Eligibilities by Gender	Evidence-based Program					Totals
		COS	EET	FFT	FIT	MST	
Female	Number	319	174	249	44	75	861
	Percent	29.8	25.6	28.7	41.5	32.9	29.2
Male	Number	753	505	619	62	153	2,092
	Percent	70.2	74.4	71.3	58.5	67.1	70.8
Total	Number	1,072	679	868	106	228	2,953
	Percent	100	100	100	100	100	100

JUVENILE COURT BLOCK GRANT

Table 10 displays eligibility by race. During the assessment process, a youth may be identified as “other/unknown” racial category.

Table 10: Program eligibility in fiscal year 2022 by race

Race	Number or percent of eligibilities by program	Evidence-based Program					Totals
		COS	EET	FFT	FIT	MST	
Other / Unknown	Number	20	5	6	2	1	34
	Percent	1.9	0.7	0.7	1.9	0.4	1.2
White	Number	703	382	517	36	103	1,741
	Percent	65.5	56.3	59.6	34.1	45.2	59.0
Black / African American	Number	135	144	149	40	63	531
	Percent	12.7	21.2	17.2	37.7	27.6	18.0
American Indian / Alaskan Native	Number	32	28	45	5	11	121
	Percent	3.0	4.1	5.2	4.7	4.8	4.1
Asian	Number	26	7	5	1	0	39
	Percent	2.4	1.0	0.6	0.9	0.0	1.3
Native Hawaiian Pacific Islander	Number	13	18	17	3	4	55
	Percent	1.2	2.7	2.0	2.8	1.8	1.9
Hispanic / Latino	Number	143	95	129	19	46	432
	Percent	13.3	14.0	14.7	17.9	20.2	14.5
Totals	Number	1,072	679	868	106	228	2,953
	Percent	100	100	100	100	100	100

JUVENILE COURT BLOCK GRANT

Table 11 displays eligibility by risk level. In the 2022 fiscal year, a majority of eligibilities were assigned to high-risk youth (41.1% of eligibilities), followed by low-risk youth (34.7% of eligibilities), and moderate-risk youth (24.2% of eligibilities). Please note there is only one low-risk program and five moderate to high-risk programs.

Table 11: Program eligibility in fiscal year 2022 by risk level

Risk level	Number or percent of risk level by program	Evidence-based Program					Totals
		COS	EET	FFT	FIT	MST	
Low	Number	1,018	5	2	0	0	1,025
	Percent	95.0	0.7	0.3	0.0	0.0	34.7
Moderate	Number	45	296	343	26	5	715
	Percent	4.2	43.6	39.6	24.5	2.2	24.2
High	Number	9	378	522	80	223	1,212
	Percent	0.8	55.7	60.1	75.5	97.8	41.1
Totals	Number	1,072	679	868	106	228	2,953
	Percent	100	100	100	100	100	100

Evidence-Based Program Starts

Table 12 represents the number of program starts during SFY 2022, July 1, 2021 – June 30, 2022. Although there were 743 starts in fiscal year 2022, these were only assigned to 717 individual youth.

Table 12: Program starts in fiscal year 2022

Evidence-based Program	Count (N)	Percent of All Starts
COS	314	42.3%
EET	166	22.3%
FFT	224	30.2%
FIT	0	0.0%
MST	39	5.2%
Totals	743	100.0%

Table 13: Program starts in fiscal year 2022 by gender

Gender	Number or Percent of Starts Within Gender	Evidence-based Program					Totals
		COS	EET	FFT	FIT	MST	
Female	Number	80	36	76	0	14	206
	Percent	25.5	21.7	33.9	0.0	35.9	27.7
Male	Number	234	130	148	0	25	537
	Percent	74.5	78.3	66.1	0.0	64.1	72.3
Totals	Number	314	166	224	0	39	743
	Percent	100	100	100	0.0	100	100

JUVENILE COURT BLOCK GRANT

Table 14: Program starts in fiscal year 2022 by race

Race	Number or Percent of Starts by Program	Evidence-based Program					Totals
		COS	EET	FFT	FIT	MST	
Other / Unknown	Number	12	3		0	1	16
	Percent	3.8	1.8	0.0	0.0	2.6	2.1
White	Number	228	84	167	0	21	500
	Percent	72.6	50.6	74.6	0.0	53.9	67.3
Black / African American	Number	25	46	26	0	10	107
	Percent	8.0	27.7	11.6	0.0	25.6	14.5
American Indian / Alaskan Native	Number	8	7	6	0	1	22
	Percent	2.5	4.2	2.7	0.0	2.6	3.0
Asian	Number	5	1	1	0	0	7
	Percent	1.6	0.6	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.9
Native Hawaiian Pacific Islander	Number	4	4	3	0	0	11
	Percent	1.3	1.4	1.3	0.0	0.0	1.5
Hispanic / Latino	Number	32	21	21	0	6	80
	Percent	10.2	12.7	9.4	0.0	15.4	10.7
Totals	Number	314	166	224	0	39	743
	Percent	100	100	100	0	100	100

Table 15 shows EBP starts based upon assessed risk level. COS is a program that is designed for low-risk offenders, and therefore it is not surprising that 98.7% of COS starts have an associated low-risk level. A majority of moderate and high-risk youth start EET and/or FFT. The smaller number of starts for FIT and MST reflect the limited availability of these programs in Washington (see Washington State County Juvenile Courts, EBP Starts – 2022 Map, p. 29).

JUVENILE COURT BLOCK GRANT

Table 15: Program starts in fiscal year 2022 by risk level


Risk level	Number or Percent of Risk Level by Program	Evidence-based Program					Totals
		COS	EET	FFT	FIT	MST	
Unknown	Number	2	0	1	0	1	4
	Percent	0.6	0.0	0.4	0.0	2.6	0.5
Low	Number	310	1	2	0	0	313
	Percent	98.7	0.6	0.9	0.0	0.0	42.2
Moderate	Number	2	81	114	0	0	197
	Percent	0.6	48.8	50.9	0.0	0.0	26.5
High	Number	0	84	107	0	38	229
	Percent	0.0	50.6	47.8	0.0	97.4	30.8
Totals	Number	314	166	224	0	39	743
	Percent	100	100	100	0	100	100

Table 16 and Figure 3 provide a historical perspective on the number of EBP starts across SFY 2017-2021.

Table 16: Historical starts for state fiscal years 2017-2021

EBP	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	Total
WSART	999	821	815	405	177	3,217
COS	720	707	655	405	339	2,826
EET	89	193	232	235	162	911
FFT	534	524	501	421	293	2,273
FIT	10	14	14	10	1	49
MST	76	55	44	67	52	294
Total	2,428	2,314	2,261	1,543	1,024	9,570

Figure 3: Historical starts for state fiscal years 2017-2021



Evidence-Based Program Successful Completes

Table 17 displays successful completes by program. In fiscal year 2022, the data identified 562 successful program completes across the state and 544 youth who successfully completed EBPs.

Table 17: Successful completes in fiscal year 2022

Program	Frequency	Percent of All Successful Completes
COS	291	51.8%
EET	88	15.7%
FFT	145	25.8%
FIT	1	0.1%
MST	37	6.6%
All Successful Completes	562	100.0%

Table 18: Successful completes in fiscal year 2022 by gender

Gender	Number or Percent of Completers Within Gender	Evidence-based Program					Totals
		COS	EET	FFT	FIT	MST	
Female	Number	72	24	48	0	13	157
	Percent	24.7	27.3	33.1	0.0	35.1	27.9
Male	Number	219	64	97	1	24	405
	Percent	75.3	72.7	66.9	100.0	64.9	72.1
Totals	Number	291	88	145	1	37	562
	Percent	100	100	100	100	100	100

JUVENILE COURT BLOCK GRANT

Table 19: Successful completes in FY 2022 by race

Race	Number or Percent of Completes by Program	Evidence-based Program					Totals
		COS	EET	FFT	FIT	MST	
Other / Unknown	Number	11	1	1	0	0	13
	Percent	3.8	1.1	0.7	0.0	0.0	2.3
White	Number	210	50	115	0	16	391
	Percent	72.2	56.8	79.2	0.0	43.2	69.6
Black / African American	Number	25	17	13	0	9	64
	Percent	8.6	19.3	9.0	0.0	24.3	11.3
American Indian / Alaskan Native	Number	7	5	0	0	2	14
	Percent	2.4	5.7	0.0	0.0	5.4	2.5
Asian	Number	5	1	2	1	2	11
	Percent	1.7	1.1	1.4	100.0	5.4	2.0
Native Hawaiian Pacific Islander	Number	4	1	1	0	0	6
	Percent	1.4	1.1	0.7	0.0	0.0	1.1
Hispanic / Latino	Number	29	13	13	0	8	63
	Percent	10.0	14.8	9.0	0.0	21.6	11.2
Totals	Number	291	88	145	1	37	562
	Percent	100	100	100	100	100	100

Table 20: Successful completes in FY 2022 by risk level

Risk level	Number or Percent of Risk Level by Program	Evidence-based Program					Totals
		COS	EET	FFT	FIT	MST	
Unknown	Number	2	0	0	0	1	3
	Percent	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.7	0.5
Low	Number	287	0	2	0	0	289
	Percent	98.6	0.0	1.4	0.0	0.0	51.4
Moderate	Number	2	44	86	0	0	132
	Percent	0.7	50.0	59.3	0.0	0.0	23.5
High	Number	0	44	57	1	36	138
	Percent	0.0	50.0	39.3	100.0	97.3	24.6
Totals	Number	291	88	145	1	37	562
	Percent	100	100	100	100	100	100


JUVENILE COURT BLOCK GRANT

Table 21 and Figure 4 outline the historical successful proportions of completion by EBP. A very high proportion of low-risk program participants (COS) successfully complete, with a five-year average at 94.8%. Whereas the majority of moderate and high-risk program participants successfully complete their program, on average, between 54.2% (EET) and 71.2% (MST) of the time.

Table 21: Historical successful completes for state fiscal years 2017-2021

EBP		2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	Total
WSART	Number	625	592	482	281	-	1,980
	Percent	67.3	72.1	59.1	69.4	-	66.7
COS	Number	671	676	632	382	290	2,651
	Percent	96.1	95.6	95.6	94.3	92.4	95.2
EET	Number	43	104	150	107	69	473
	Percent	65.2	53.9	64.7	45.5	41.6	53.0
FFT	Number	383	353	354	322	109	1,521
	Percent	73.1	67.4	70.7	76.5	48.7	69.4
FIT	Number	13	11	13	11	-	48
	Percent	86.7	78.6	92.9	110	-	90.6
MST	Number	56	39	40	48	19	202
	Percent	74.7	70.9	90.0	71.6	48.7	72.0
Total	Number	1,791	1,775	1,671	1,151	487	6,875
	Percent	77.2	73.1	78.8	77.9	57.9	74.8

Figure 4: Historical successful completes for state fiscal years 2017-2021



Eligible for an Evidence-Based Program but Did Not Start

There are many reasons why a youth determined eligible for an EBP does not start the program. Using PACT assessment data for youth who were determined eligible in fiscal year 2022, the most common reason for youth not starting an EBP were:

Table 22: Reasons for not starting an EBP

Reasons	N	%
Youth willing, but not able to participate	342	28%
Waiting for/involved in other intervention	262	21%
Youth/family refused	238	19%
Involved with other EBP	225	18%
Already completed EBP	80	6%
Incarcerated	59	5%
Whereabouts unknown	31	3%
Deceased	2	0%
Total	1,239	100%

Table 22 shows the majority of instances where a youth did not start a program were due to a youth willing, but not able to participate; were involved in another intervention; or the youth/family refused. A smaller proportion of youth were either incarcerated or whereabouts unknown. Please note that these counts are based on assessments and not unique youth. Youth may be assessed as eligible for more than one program, and each count would be reflected here.

Started an Evidence-Based Program but Did Not Complete

Among youth who started an EBP in fiscal year 2022, but did not successfully complete the program, a majority did not complete due to the following reasons:

Table 23: Reasons for not completing an EBP

Reasons	N	%
Dropped out	61	44%
Doesn't meet completion requirements	37	27%
Removed from program	11	8%
Moved	8	6%
Scheduling conflict	8	6%
Incarcerated	6	4%
Whereabouts unknown	5	4%
Deceased	1	1%
Transportation	1	1%
Total	138	100%

Table 23 shows reasons similar to youth that do not start an EBP. The primary reasons youth do not successfully complete a program relate to two primary categories – doesn't meet program completion requirements and lack of buy-in or engagement with the program (dropped out). Note that youth can only

qualify for one reason per EBP and, in most cases, the service provider determines whether a youth is removed from a program or does not meet completion requirements.

Evidence-Based Program Expenditures

Table 24: Expenditures by category for fiscal year 2022³

Programs	CJAA Expenditures	EBE Expenditures	Total Expenditures	Cost Per Participant
COS	\$216,359	\$156,884	\$373,243	\$1,188
EET	\$1,227,804	\$0	\$1,227,804	\$7,396
FFT	\$60,170	\$897,755	\$957,925	\$4,276
FIT	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
MST	\$6,214	\$461,386	\$467,600	\$11,990
Totals	\$1,510,547	\$1,516,026	\$3,026,572	\$4,073

Table 24 represents program expenditure information as reported by the juvenile courts to JR by program and by category – CJAA and Evidence-Based Expansion (EBE) for SFY 2022, July 1, 2021 – June 30, 2022. The cost per participant is calculated by dividing the total expenditures in SFY 2022 by the total number of starters in SFY 2022. Due to the impacts of COVID-19, these costs are much higher than in previous years.


Table 25 and Figure 5 provide information on EBP expenditures from state fiscal years 2017–2021. Beginning in 2017, expenditures have steadily declined.

Table 25: Expenditures for state fiscal years 2017-2021

EBP	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
WSART	\$1,724,601	\$1,474,875	\$1,456,840	\$926,829	\$501,397
COS	\$429,947	\$378,235	\$426,677	\$328,116	\$345,793
EET	\$528,352	\$606,123	\$697,836	\$1,099,116	\$1,119,031
FFT	\$1,542,304	\$1,488,687	\$1,358,068	\$1,357,869	\$1,057,057
FIT	\$250,241	\$222,526	\$33,931	\$57,926	\$0
MST	\$183,368	\$230,052	\$291,508	\$304,710	\$722,353
Total	\$4,658,813	\$4,400,498	\$4,264,860	\$4,074,565	\$3,745,632

³ Expenditure information includes data as of August 26, 2022.

Figure 5: Expenditures for state fiscal year 2017-2021



Promising Programs Starts

Promising Programs are those programs that have applied to the CJAA Advisory Committee, completed the Promising Program Guidelines, and received approval for “Promising Program” status by the CJAA Advisory Committee. There are currently four approved Promising inPrograms.

Table 26: Program starts in state fiscal year 2022

Promising Program	Count (N)
Individual – Alternative Change Training (i-ACT)	111
Team – Alternative Change Training (Team-ACT)	0
Total	111

Table 26 represents the number of promising program youth that started a program during SFY 2022, July 1, 2021 – June 30, 2022.

Promising Program Expenditures

Table 27: Expenditures by program for fiscal year 2022⁴

Promising Program	Expenditures	Cost per Participant
Individual – Alternative Change Training (i-ACT)	\$663,216	\$5,975
Team – Alternative Change Training (Team-ACT)	\$59,602	\$0
Total	\$722,818	\$6,512

Table 27 represents program expenditure information as reported by the juvenile courts to JR for SFY 2022, July 1, 2021 – June 30, 2022. The cost per participant is calculated by dividing the total expenditures in SFY 2022 by the total number of starts in SFY 2022.

Referred Youth

As stated previously, the Community Juvenile Accountability Act (CJAA) was passed as an incentive to local communities to implement cost-effective interventions to reduce recidivism among juvenile offenders. The

⁴ Expenditure information includes data as of August 26, 2022.

Act’s primary purpose is to “provide a continuum of community-based programs that emphasize a juvenile offender’s accountability for his or her actions while assisting him or her in the development of skills necessary to function effectively and positively in the community in a manner consistent with public safety (RCW 13.40.500).”

This was a marked change in the expectations related to juvenile justice programming. The legislation provided funding through the state’s JR to local juvenile courts to implement research-based programs that reduce the risk of recidivism. Prior to the passing of ESB 5429 (2019), only youth who were formally diverted or adjudicated were eligible for these state-funded EBPs.

This legislation (ESB 5429) allows referred youth to access state-funded EBPs earlier, prior to any official juvenile justice involvement. As defined in ESB 5429 (amending RCW 13.40.510), “referred youth” means a youth who:

- Was contacted by a law enforcement officer, and the law enforcement officer has probable cause to believe that he or she had committed a crime.
- Was referred to a program that allows youth to enter before being diverted or charged with a juvenile offense.
- Would have been diverted or charged with a juvenile offense if not for the program to which he or she was referred.

County-by-County Description of Juvenile Court Referred Youth

After the passage of this bill, a statewide process was developed and implemented to risk assess and serve these referred youth in EBPs. If and how these referred youth are assessed and served, is a local juvenile court decision and will vary from court to court. Currently, Pierce County Juvenile Court is the only one that served referred youth, following the statewide process, with EBPs in SFY 2022.

Table 28: Referred Youth Assessed by Risk Level – SFY 2022

Court	Low	Moderate	High	Total
Pierce	1	0	0	1
Totals	1	0	0	1

Table 29: Referred Youth Served (EBPs) – SFY 2022

Court	COS	FFT	Totals
Pierce	1	0	1
Totals	1	0	1

Indian Tribal Evidence-Based Programs

In September 1999, JR initiated discussions with the Department of Social and Health Services’ Indian Policy Advisory Committee to implement elements of effective juvenile justice programs for court-involved tribal youth through CJAA grant opportunities.

Since then, JR has provided CJAA grant opportunities to federally recognized tribes and Recognized American Indian Organizations to implement programs with research-based components. Twenty-nine tribes and four Recognized American Indian Organizations are eligible for funds. From July 1, 2021, through June 30, 2022, seven tribes and one Recognized American Indian Organizations applied for and received \$9,233 each to implement a researched-based intervention with court-involved tribal youth. These funds are combined with other sources of funding to support the delivery of programs with research-based components.

Participating Tribes

- Cowlitz
- Jamestown S’Klallam
- Makah
- Muckleshoot
- Tulalip
- Yakama
- Nooksack


Participating Recognized American Indian Organizations (RAIO)

- Native Project

Juvenile Court Evidence-Based Program Map

Attachment A

**Washington State County Juvenile Courts
Evidence Based Program Starts — 2022**



List of Acronyms and Terms

Appendix A

AOC: Administrative Office of the Courts.

CJAA: Community Juvenile Accountability Act. State funded program that supports evidence-based treatment for youth on probation in the juvenile courts.

COS: Coordination of Services. An evidence-based program that provides an educational program to low-risk juvenile offenders and their parents.

DCYF: Department of Children, Youth, and Families.

DMC: Disproportionate Minority Contact.

DSHS: Department of Social and Health Services.

EBE: Evidence-Based Expansion.

EBP: Evidence-Based Program. A program that has been rigorously evaluated and has shown effectiveness at addressing particular outcomes such as reduced crime, child abuse and neglect, or substance abuse. These programs often have a cost benefit to taxpayers.

EET: Education Employment Training. This program is an education and/or workforce development program for moderate and high-risk juvenile offenders.

FFT: Functional Family Therapy. A family therapy program that lasts an average of four months. This program has been shown to reduce felony recidivism and focuses on helping families improve youth behavior and reduce family conflict.

FIT: Family Integration Transitions program. A version of Multi-Systemic Therapy that is an evidence-based family intervention model for youth with co-occurring disorders.

GOAL: Girls Only Active Learning. A group-based intervention for females modeled after WSART. This program is intended for the most vulnerable girls in our state and it combines demonstrated effective approaches for recidivism reduction with the research on girl-specific development and needs.

JR: Juvenile Rehabilitation. The program area within DCYF responsible for rehabilitation of court-committed juvenile offenders.

ISD: Information Services Division.

MST: Multi-Systemic Therapy. An evidence-based family treatment model that reduces juvenile offender recidivism.

PACT: Positive Achievement Change Tool (PACT) assessment. The PACT is a 126-item, multiple-choice assessment instrument that produces risk-level scores measuring a juvenile’s risk of re-offending.

RED: Racial and Ethnic Disparities.

SFY: State Fiscal Year.

WAJCA: Washington Association of Juvenile Court Administrators.

WSART: Washington State Aggression Replacement Training. A Cognitive Behavior Therapy program using skill-building that has been rigorously evaluated and reduces recidivism with juvenile offenders.

WSCCR: The Washington State Center for Court Research is the research arm of the AOC. It was established in 2004 by order of the Washington State Supreme Court.

WSIPP: Washington State Institute for Public Policy.