

THE KING COUNTY (WASHINGTON) SYSTEMS INTEGRATION INITIATIVE: A FIRST LOOK AT THE KENT DISTRICT DUAL SYSTEM YOUTH PILOT PROGRAM

Models for Change “On the Ground”

Gene Siegel, Senior Research Consultant, National Center for Juvenile Justice, June 2009

As the *Models for Change* initiative reaches important milestones across the four participating states – Pennsylvania, Illinois, Louisiana, and Washington – the National Center for Juvenile Justice (NCJJ) will document examples of key progress that reflect promising system changes at the “ground level.” These brief looks or snapshots will describe key reforms that, in at least some cases, are prompting system change at the “kid level,” and that relate to applicable targeted areas of improvement and/or strategic opportunities for change.

Model for Change Snapshot: King County

This inaugural report focuses on the Kent District’s Dual System Youth Pilot Program, an early component of the King County Systems Integration Initiative in Washington State. In brief, the goal of the King County System’s Integration Initiative is to increase and improve access to effective programs and services that can serve as alternatives to formal processing in the juvenile justice system, including access by youth needing mental health, substance abuse and education services, dual jurisdiction youth and minor/low risk offenders.¹ As discussed here, the Kent District pilot program has been carefully designed to improve cross-system case assessment, case planning, and case management for dually-involved youth. This paper will provide an initial snapshot of the pilot program and its important early stage accomplishments.

Background

A growing body of research continues to show that juveniles involved in multiple systems, including the child welfare and juvenile justice systems, present an extraordinary range of challenges.² Typically, when compared to similar juveniles who do not have multi-system involvement, these challenges manifest in a range of adverse outcomes that have serious negative consequences for the future of these children. Some of these include:

- ◆ Overall, higher recidivism rates for multi-system youth.
- ◆ Dramatically higher recidivism rates for first-time

referred female juveniles, in stark contrast to the general population of first-time offenders in which boys are considerably more likely to recidivate than girls.³

- ◆ Earlier onset of delinquent behavior.
- ◆ Substantially higher out of home placement rates, including more detention stays, and frequent placement changes.
- ◆ Poor permanency outcomes.

In the face of these and other challenges, the King County Juvenile Court launched its “Systems Integration Initiative” in 2003 to promote improved cross-system handling of these complex and difficult cases. The King County Systems Integration Initiative, or KC-SII, is a collaboration of State and local community agencies and organizations that have come together to examine and improve coordinated program development, policy development, and assessment and case management for children, youth and families served by the child welfare and juvenile justice systems as well as other youth-serving entities (e.g., the education system and behavioral/mental health providers).

During the ensuing four years, there have been many important accomplishments achieved through the KC-SII. Some of the more notable accomplishments include:

- ◆ The development of information sharing agreements and protocols;
- ◆ The specification of technological functionalities needed to facilitate the sharing of data and information on multi-system cases;
- ◆ The completion of an assessment of the local mental health services continuum;
- ◆ The design of a pilot school dropout retrieval and retention program; and,
- ◆ The development of cross-training and joint policy/procedural protocols to facilitate cross-system case-work.

Over the course of the first four years of the project, the King County Juvenile Court and the Washington State Children's Administration, Division of Children's and Family Services (DCFS is the division that oversees child welfare services in Washington) have collaborated with a range of key local partners and stakeholders to formulate multi-agency protocols and strategies to enhance dual system (i.e., child welfare and juvenile justice) case management practices and outcomes. Three other key partners – the Child Welfare League of America (CWLA), the Center for Juvenile Justice Reform at Georgetown University, and the Casey Family Foundation – have also provided critical technical assistance to the KC-SII.⁴

These protocols served as key points for the development of training, new levels of cross-system working relationships, and the ability to identify many of the specific plans and critical tasks emerging from implementation of the protocols. However, it is fair to say that the 'protocol aspect' of KC-SII work is still being developed and implemented, as the project moves forward.

As a result of this hard work and extraordinary cooperation, King County recently initiated the Kent District pilot program, a program that has been carefully designed to improve cross-system case assessment, case planning, and case management for dually-involved youth.

How many cross-system cases are there in King County?

Previous research on cross-system or dual jurisdiction youth has shown that determining the precise number of such cases can be a formidable task. In brief, depending upon how one defines "cross-over" or "dual system" cases, the frequency may range from perhaps 10% of all adjudicated cases to much higher frequencies that expand counts to include any type of dual system involvement (i.e., not just formal adjudication).⁵

In King County, the target population for the pilot program involves youth who have been adjudicated in both the dependency and offender components of the juvenile court system. However, one of the interesting aspects of the King County effort is that while there have been some estimates of the prevalence of dual system or multi-system cases, there has not been a thorough county-wide analysis in this regard. That is about to change with the assistance of the MacArthur Foundation's *Models for Change* initiative.

The King County Multi-System Youth Prevalence Study

The Multi-System Youth Prevalence Study will be conducted through a cooperative effort and will involve the Washington State Administrative Office of the Courts' Center for Court Research (WSCCR), the National Center for Juvenile Justice (NCJJ, a member of the *Models for Change* National Resource Bank), and the King County Juvenile Court.

In brief, in addition to determining the actual number of dually adjudicated cases for a specific time period, the King County prevalence study will examine a range of key case characteristics of multi-system involved youth. It is envisioned that this study will result in:

- ◆ The development of a baseline summary that profiles critical case characteristics of dual-system youth who come into contact with the juvenile court (i.e., on an offender, Becca,⁶ and/or dependency matter) and provide some reliable estimates of the size of this population for designated time periods.
- ◆ Support the development of specific coordinated intervention strategies with various sub-populations of dual-system youth based on case characteristics highlighted in the baseline profile summaries.
- ◆ Provide the ability to examine (at least, preliminarily) the degree to which these interventions are having an impact on case outcomes and to provide the empirical basis for more rigorous future evaluations.
- ◆ Provide a local template for how to conduct future research of this type on an on-going basis and to engage the local expertise needed to provide such research support without future outside consultation.

In contrast to previous research on dual system cases conducted by NCJJ in Arizona that heavily relied on time-consuming paper case file reviews, the King County analysis is designed to rely almost entirely on administrative data extracted from the various automated systems utilized by the King County Juvenile Court, DCFS, and the State Juvenile Rehabilitation Agency (JRA is the state youth corrections agency in Washington.) Furthermore, NCJJ will be working closely with WSCCR on this study to help develop the in-state capacity for sustaining this research, not only in King County, but in other counties that hope to tackle systems integration reform. One important aim, consis-

tent with *Models for Change*, is to develop an ongoing multi-system youth research approach in Washington State that can serve as a model for the rest of the country.

The Multi-System Youth Prevalence Study is progressing through an important early phase with automated data extracts being reviewed by WSCCR and NCJJ for case matching purposes, and other quality assurance steps to ensure reliable and valid comparative analyses. Ultimately, it is hoped that the first phase of this important study will be completed by December 2009.⁷ Meanwhile, King County has moved forward with an initial pilot program that is serving as the “incubator” for broader system improvements.

Moving King County’s Systems Integration Initiative from planning to action

King County stakeholders, including the KC-SII Executive Steering Committee and others, have moved from the important strategic planning stages to implementing systems change on the ground. In 2008, local stakeholders decided to focus their project on the following key aspects to improve the handling of cross-system cases:

1. Case assessment,
2. Case planning,
3. Case management.

As discussed in this paper, by establishing an initial pilot program in the Kent District of King County (an area of the county that has a substantial number of dually-involved youth), local stakeholders are beginning to track the impact of changes in these three key realms. Not surprisingly, development and initiation of the pilot program has taken some time to get off the ground but, as the following sections delineate, King County and its partners have been intentionally deliberate and thoughtful in structuring this systems change approach.

The Breakthrough Series Collaborative: A framework for change

One of the most important decisions made in King County involved the adoption of a proven framework for implementing changes in policies and practices. Specifically, the KC-SII decided to adopt the “Breakthrough Series Collaborative” or BSC model as its system change approach. The BSC approach, first developed

in the health care field, has been successfully adapted and applied by Casey Family Programs in a number of its internal program improvement efforts. Georgetown University’s Center for Juvenile Justice Reform has worked with King County stakeholders, CWLA, and Casey Family Programs to further adapt the BSC so that it can meet the unique challenges and complexities associated with dual system realities.

Establishing a “core team” to prioritize and implement changes

Within the BSC framework, King County established a “core team” that has been able to move the project from the planning phases to the concrete action stages. Members of this core team include a Juvenile Court Judge, the Juvenile Court Administrator, a probation supervisor from the Juvenile Court’s probation unit, a supervisor from a DCFS unit, a parent and child who had prior multi-system involvement, a Youth Services (service provider) representative, as well as one probation officer and one social worker. In addition to the core team, local stakeholders also created an “extended team” made up of local law enforcement officials, social service providers, and other parents and children who have provided feedback on the pilot program before and after its implementation.

Identifying key “Change Package Components”

To further clarify areas of policies and practices that would be the subjects of systems change efforts in the Kent District, the BSC approach helped local officials identify six broad “Change Package Components.”

The six Change Package Components are, in effect, *performance indicators* that reflect improved or promising practices and processes. These components offer a common frame of reference for program planners and have helped local stakeholders implement the pilot effort.

The six Change Package Components, and examples of related subcomponents (performance indicators/measures)⁸ that will be tracked over time, include:

1. Measurable systems of agency/interagency accountability

- ◆ Building a shared set of beliefs across all partner agencies that supports joint responsibility for cross-over cases, and
- ◆ Establishing processes in the court to ensure that

judges will be aware of cross-system involvement and that the court will calendar these cases appropriately.

2. Active engagement of family and youth in planning and decision-making

- ◆ Ensuring that children/youth are actively/authentically engaged in the design and evaluation of the project,
- ◆ Making sure that clear information about agency and family roles/responsibilities is shared openly and agreed upon during cross-system team processes,
- ◆ Taking special efforts to advise all dually-involved children/families of their rights and intentionally preparing them to participate in assessment, case planning, court proceedings, etc.

3. Integrated systems of information compilation and sharing

- ◆ Creating an integrated information system that can identify and track children involved in multiple systems,
- ◆ Establishing processes that will actively “mine data” and that will assist staff in identifying unique characteristics of these cases, and
- ◆ Providing regular cross training for staff.

4. Shared approach to identification, assessment, and case plan development within and across systems

- ◆ Initiating a practice model that addresses early identification of cross-over youth,
- ◆ Developing a unified assessment approach between child welfare and juvenile probation, and
- ◆ Implementing coordinated case planning and joint case plan reviews.

5. Shared case management, decision-making and community service utilization

- ◆ Implementing sound clinical practices that result in optimal child and community safety,
- ◆ Maximizing the use of evidence based practices,
- ◆ Making sure that case decisions are open, transparent, and grounded in integrated assessment tools, and

- ◆ Utilizing specific interventions that are likely to reduce detention bias for children in foster care.

6. Effective use of blended resources

- ◆ Establishing interagency agreements that guide the pooling of funding to serve cross-over youth, and
- ◆ Identifying services, service providers and funding sources that cross both systems.

In effect, the Change Package Components offer broad reference points from which local stakeholders may further clarify key indicators of systems change and implement more specific actions on the ground.

Plan-Do-Study-Act

The BSC approach is intended to foster quick and productive changes in practices while eliminating obstacles to such changes. The approach involves four relatively simple stages commonly referred to as the PDSA process – the acronym referring to “Plan Do Study Act.” As shown in this section, the core team has used these four stages to address the multitude of challenges associated with translating policies and practices into real substantive action.

Over the course of a series of weekly meetings, the core team used the PDSA process to identify targeted areas for systems change and the specific steps necessary to launch improvements in those areas. The PDSAs initially identified by the core team included:

- ◆ Provide detention staffers with a list of DCFS Social Workers and their contact information in order to decrease the time taken to notify assigned workers when a dual system youth is detained.
- ◆ Establish a safe process that allows dual system youth to be released from detention and transported to the appropriate DCFS unit (this component is limited to youth who are assessed as “low” runaway risks).
- ◆ Hold joint probation/DCFS unit meetings to promote probation officer and social worker interaction and exchanges of ideas.
- ◆ Hold regular community planning meetings to ensure that the area or region selected for a local systems integration project have input in its design, implementation, and evaluation. – This included the engagement of local service providers in an effort to expedite treatment planning.

- ◆ Increase and sustain parent and youth involvement in both the core team and extended team.
- ◆ Attempt to create a “system educator” position. Ideally, the person filling this role would be someone (e.g., a parent) who has had direct experience with multi-system involvement. The system educator would be responsible for helping families and youth understand the oft-confusing paths associated with the child welfare and juvenile justice systems.

Overall, the goal of the PDSA process is to eliminate or

reduce barriers that get in the way of making prompt system changes, changes that, it is hoped, will improve outcomes for multi-system youth. The process offers a simple method for moving things forward, albeit in one pilot site initially, and it uses a “from-the-bottom-up” approach (i.e., local social workers and probation officers, working with the core teams, were instrumental in identifying the PDSAs) that can be incubated in one site and then spread to others.

In King County, the Kent District area was selected as the first pilot site for a number of reasons discussed

Breakthrough Series Collaborative PDSA Form
Enabling More Timely DCFS Detention Visitation

Change Package Component: Measures Child Well Being– Number of institutional placements (i.e. residential care, group care, detention) of cross over youth.

Barrier to Practice: DCFS social workers are required to request permission of the probation department to visit youth in detention. Once approved, the probation department must contact the detention supervisor on duty, requesting the DCFS social worker be approved to visit. The barrier is that, many times, probation is unavailable to respond to the request immediately. This may prolong detention stays, as DCFS is unable to promptly access youth to assess needs and to develop appropriate placement options.

Strategy to Overcome the Barrier: Allow DCFS social workers to visit youth in detention without requesting advanced permission from probation.

Small Test of Change: After change in policy, Kent DCFS social workers will be allowed to promptly visit youth in detention without prior permission.

INDIVIDUAL TESTS

Plan: *What* are we going to do?

- 1) Request Detention Administration to override policy and to allow Kent DCFS social workers to visit youth in detention without prior permission.
- 2) Provide list of Kent DCFS social workers to detention.
- 3) Inform Kent DCFS and probation of new policy.

Who will do it? Kelli Lauritzen (Juvenile Probation Unit Supervisor)

When will it be done? By 12/31/08

Hypotheses (what do you expect will happen)? Allowing DCFS social workers to meet with youth immediately will improve case planning. This will lead to earlier placement planning and less detention time.

Do: When will it be completed? 1/31/09

Study: Did what you expect to happen, actually happen? Yes, policy has been implemented.

Act/Adjust: What learning will you apply to your next test cycle?

Create a new small test of change based on what you have learned from this test. Can the new test be larger or spread? This step has been initiated. Detention stays are being tracked for all applicable cross system cases.

later in this paper. This PDSA approach hinges on the belief that you immerse key decision makers, direct care practitioners, and stakeholders in a process that allows for prompt changes and that you give these key persons the tools they need to make those changes happen.

A few ways the PDSA approach has been implemented in King County

As shown, the PDSA approach provides a consistent framework for implementing timely system change that can affect how individual cross-system cases are handled. The PDSA form provides a standard planning format that requires stakeholders to clarify barriers to change, to identify strategies to overcome those barriers, to offer a small test of whether meaningful change

actually occurs, followed by individual PDSA “tests” that require specific follow-up actions.

Example 1: Removing barriers to DCFS social worker detention visits

As noted, cross-system youth tend to be detained more frequently and tend to experience longer detention stays than single system cases. Through the PDSA change process, King County officials quickly established a change in a long-standing policy that had inhibited timely involvement of DCFS social workers when cross-system youth were detained.⁹

Through this change in policy,¹⁰ it is hoped that the length of time that dual system youth stay in detention will be significantly decreased by enabling assigned

Breakthrough Series Collaborative PDSA Form
DCFS/Juvenile Probation Joint Meetings

Change Package Component: Measure of Workers Understanding and Ability to do Cross-System Assessment and Case Planning Work – Number of workers who report access to cross-agency client and case data, and Number of workers who report knowing the identity of and how to contact their counterparts working with the same family.

Barrier to Practice: DCFS social workers and juvenile probation lack understanding of each agency’s policies and procedures and the limitations of each system. This lack of knowledge does not allow for effective working relationships or shared case planning, which in turn is not positive for youth. In addition, many workers and probation officers are not aware of whom their counterparts are across systems.

Strategy to Overcome the Barrier: Provide a structure for professionals in each system to engage in regular face-to-face interactions with their counterparts, allowing professionals to become more familiar with both systems and the roles of their counterparts.

Small Test of Change: Provide an avenue for Kent DCFS and juvenile probation to meet to discuss each system, their services, and to develop effective working relationships.

INDIVIDUAL TESTS

Plan: *What* are we going to do? Set monthly Kent DCFS/juvenile probation meeting.

Who will do it? Jeanine Tacchini (DCFS Supervisor) and Kelli Lauritzen (Juvenile Probation Supervisor)

When will it be done? By 12/31/08 (implemented ahead of schedule, 9/08).

Hypotheses (what do you expect will happen)? Having joint unit meetings will enhance the understanding of each system and allow face-to-face interaction. This in turn will build better working relationships, which will improve cross-system case assessment, case planning, and case management.

Do: When will it be complete? 1/31/09 (joint meetings are now standard practice)

Study: Did what you expect to happen, actually happen? Yes. Regular meetings are occurring.

Act/Adjust: What learning will you apply to your next test cycle?

Create a new small test of change based on what you have learned from this test. Can the new test be larger or spread? *Pending*

social workers to have prompt access to detention, and by enabling workers to take steps to move children to more appropriate settings. The PDSA Form on page five offers an overview of the steps taken to implement this change.

This policy alteration is in its early stages and, as the PDSA form reveals, there are segments of the plan (e.g., the Study phase and the Act/Adjust phase) that are only now being addressed. Again, one key aspect of the PDSA approach is that it is a continual process that builds on itself with each change being continually tracked to assess its impact and to determine if subsequent modifications are needed.

Example 2: Promoting regular joint DCFS/juvenile probation meetings

Historically, communication between juvenile probation officers and DCFS social workers has been rather haphazard. The quality and thoroughness of coordination between the two entities often relied on the dedication, experience, and initiative of individual social workers and/or probation officers who sensed the benefits of working together on these complex cases. But in too many cases, cross system communication only occurred when a dual system case experienced serious problems or when there was a funding dispute for services.

Breakthrough Series Collaborative PDSA Form
Creating the "System Educator"

Change Package Component:¹¹ Shared Case Management, Decision Making & Community Service Utilization.

Barrier to Practice: Families lack basic understanding of the process for both Juvenile Justice (offender adjudication) and Child Welfare (dependency)

Strategy to Overcome the Barrier: Assign a "System Educator" that is a trained volunteer who is knowledgeable about the dependency and offender systems. Draw from the AmeriCorps volunteer program that mentors youth from both systems to recruit System Educators and to set appropriate roles.

Small Test of Change: Assign a "System Educator" to the family for the next new case entering the King South Adolescent FCWS unit through the Dependency process.

INDIVIDUAL TESTS

Plan: *What* are we going to do? Assign an educator to one family. Provide overview training to the educator.

Who is going to do it? Gia Wesley, DCFS, will identify the System Educator.

When will it be done? Original plan called for the Educator to be identified by 12/10/08, and trained by 12/15/08.

Hypotheses (what do you expect will happen)? The family and youth will feel supported, prepared and connected to the child welfare and juvenile justice systems with the System Educator assisting them.

Do: When will it be complete? *On hold as of May, 2009.*

Study: What did you expect to happen, actually happen? No. Unforeseen factors, including budget cuts and other administrative concerns, have forced King County to put this change component on hold.

Act/Adjust: What learning will you apply to your next test cycle? Pending.

Create a new small test of change based on what you have learned from this test. Can the new test be larger or spread? *Pending.*

To minimize these inconsistencies, the professionals in King County have initiated a simple change that should lead to better communication across agencies. Specifically, the two agencies have agreed to hold joint DCFS/juvenile probation meetings. These began in September 2008, and all social workers and probation officers in the two pilot site units are required to attend these meetings.

The PDSA form on page six illustrates how this change has been implemented.

Example 3: The “System Educator”

Multi-system involved youth and their families are often befuddled by the complexities surrounding the juvenile justice and child welfare systems. For too many people, how these systems function appears more as an unsolvable puzzle than a source of help. To address this common confusion and to help expedite key case processing steps, the King County core teams have been exploring the concept of the “System Educator” role.

As envisioned,¹² the System Educator would work closely with families and children as their cases work their way through multiple systems. By helping families and young people navigate through the myriad of requirements posed by different systems, it is hoped that the System Educator would help reduce common conflicts that can arise, conflicts that can delay key decisions and can contribute to poor case outcomes.

As shown on the previous page, the King County core team has laid the groundwork for how the System Educator would be assigned, what the System Educator would do by when, and what may be achieved through this process. While this program component has not been implemented for a variety of reasons including budget concerns, the concept reflects another example of local innovation that eventually may further contribute to improved outcomes for multi-system youth and their families.

Why was the Kent District selected as the initial pilot site?

The Kent District of King County was selected as the first pilot program site for a number of reasons. First, a preliminary analysis of case data revealed there were more than 200 cases with at least some form of cross system contact in that region.¹³ Second, the enthusiasm and interest expressed by the two supervisors of the probation and DCFS units in that area were consid-

ered critical to successful implementation.

These two supervisors recognize the challenges associated with multi-system cases and have a keen interest in trying to improve outcomes for these young people. The two supervisors have also repeatedly demonstrated their ability to model collaboration through regular (almost daily) interactions. This collaborative spirit has filtered into both of the pilot site units where probation officers and social workers show little hesitation sharing information with their counterparts or following multi-system protocols. As the pilot project has slowly grown, DCFS social workers and juvenile probation officers have generally been faithful in coordinating case assessment, case planning, and case management efforts across agencies.

Case Example: A “before and after” look at how things have changed

Rey (not his real name) is a 15-year-old white male who recently experienced simultaneous involvement in the juvenile justice and child welfare systems. Rey's history of involvement with the dependency side of the juvenile court began many years ago when his biological parents had their parental rights terminated. Rey was subsequently adopted at age 8. Over the ensuing years, Rey's adoptive home became less and less stable, and less safe, as he grew into adolescence. This lack of stability is exemplified by Rey's placement history which includes multiple out of home stays (at least eight placement changes that are documented) as DCFS attempted to address Rey's serious mental health and behavioral problems that were compounded by serious family violence concerns.¹⁴

Unfortunately, over the past year or so Rey's situation became even more tenuous as the incidents of family violence in Rey's adoptive home escalated, particularly between Rey and his adoptive father. As a result, Rey has been unable to continue living with his adoptive parents and Rey's permanent plan calls for him to be placed out of home so that he can continue in an appropriate school and, eventually, learn to live on his own.

Rey received his first delinquency referral to juvenile court in the fall of 2008 for a burglary offense. He pled guilty to this charge, and was placed on probation. While in detention, Rey's adoptive family refused to come and get him and indicated they would not accept him back home. As a result, juvenile intake contacted DCFS for placement assistance with this challenging

case.

Below, we provide a “before and after” summary describing what, in all likelihood, would have happened to Rey at this stage, if the KC-SII and the Kent District Pilot Program were not in place at the time of his secure confinement.

Rey’s case provides a sketch of how challenging it can be to achieve effective collaboration across two systems. Without the initial shared case planning evident in this matter, the juvenile justice system would likely have focused on Rey’s behavior related to his delinquency and perhaps not emphasized the serious safety risks that Rey faced in his adoptive home. But, by having DCFS and Juvenile Probation working together, Kent District officials made sure that this child’s safety was given due consideration, along with Juvenile Probation’s concern for the safety of the community and the need for accountability related to Rey’s burglary charge. At the same time, by working together, these professionals were able to keep Rey in his special school where he receives both academic instruction and mental health services.

Rey’s situation offers one example of how the Kent District has taken the PDSA planning components– shared case planning, detention visits, joint unit meetings, etc. – and actually put them into practice.

This cooperative approach has also helped DCFS and Juvenile Probation become more familiar with each other’s system, an important development that can prevent cross agency confusion and conflict, dynamics often associated with dual jurisdiction cases. One recent experience in the Kent District illustrates the misconceptions that juvenile justice and child welfare professionals often have of one another. In this particular instance, which occurred at a joint DCFS/Juvenile Probation meeting, a Probation Counselor indicated that he thought DCFS social workers could issue warrants on dependent children who run away from placement. When this misconception came to light, a DCFS social worker was asked to provide cross training for Juvenile Probation Counselors to clarify what social workers can and cannot do. This cross training has eliminated these misunderstandings and has probably helped prevent interagency conflicts that were fairly common before the pilot program began.

Before the pilot program	Likely impact	After the pilot program	Likely impact
Intake contacts DCFS for placement assistance after adoptive parents refuse to take Rey home from detention.	Juvenile Justice Intake unaware of Rey’s past involvement with DCFS, unsure who to call and what to do next with youth who presents multiple problems.	Juvenile Justice Intake immediately determines Rey’s prior DCFS involvement via direct access to DCFS computer system.	DCFS promptly agrees to conduct Family Assessment, pursuant to new KC-SII protocol; Rey released to shelter placement.
DCFS declines to accept case and Juvenile Justice system tries to determine what to do after Rey pleads guilty to burglary charge with a probation disposition.	Rey experiences extended stay in detention because there is no one and no place to safely release him to.	Intake promptly contacts DCFS, DCFS follows Systems Integration protocol and conducts family assessment and sets shared case planning meeting.	DCFS social workers, Juvenile Probation Counselors, Rey’s adoptive parents, Rey himself, and reps from Rey’s school, are all notified re. shared case planning mtg.
Detention releases Rey after the social worker working with Rey’s defense attorney advises Rey to go to a voluntary shelter.	Rey goes to voluntary shelter but runs away before 2-week maximum stay is completed, resulting in a warrant issued for probation violation.	Rey is released to temporary shelter; DCFS and Juvenile Probation promptly hold shared case planning meeting. Rey is visited at the shelter by his probation officer.	At shared case planning meeting, DCFS, Juvenile Probation and others (including adoptive parents) determine it will not be safe for Rey to return home.
Juvenile justice system unaware of safety issues in Rey’s home, unaware of Rey’s special school status, and ill equipped to deal with MH & dependency needs.	Rey ends up in detention again for probation violation, court hearing for probation violation set on crowded court docket; court releases Rey to shelter again.	Shared case planning participants agree that new dependency petition should be filed to allow DCFS to provide assistance re. Rey’s safety, suitable placement, treatment, etc.	Dependency petition promptly filed allowing DCFS to take action; all members of shared case planning group agree to file petition due to child safety concerns.
Juvenile probation finds group home placement for Rey but it is not in Rey’s home school district, forcing Rey to change schools and go to a mainstream school.	Rey unable to handle mainstream school and becomes truant almost immediately.	At the shared case planning meeting, Rey’s current school, a special school for youth with mental health problems, ensures all stakeholders that Rey will continue to be served by the school if Rey can be placed within the district.	DCFS promptly identifies a group home in the district, allowing Rey to remain in the appropriate school setting; Rey has never been truant at this school.
Rey detained again for probation violation stemming from failure to attend school and running away.	Repeated detention stays exacerbate Rey’s exposure to delinquent peers and compound Rey’s mental health problems.	Rey ran away from his group home placement and is now in a different group home since mid May.	Rey’s special school continues to work with both agencies to meet Rey’s special needs, despite the group home change.
Juvenile Probation becomes increasingly frustrated trying to find a placement for Rey.	Rey continues to penetrate the juvenile justice system and is committed to JRA.	Rey’s case continues with shared case management between DCFS and Juvenile Probation.	Other than Rey’s runaway from the group home, he has not been arrested for any new offenses.

What types of data and outcomes are being tracked and by whom?

King County has been working very closely with CWLA and the Georgetown Center for Juvenile Justice Reform to ensure that appropriate data are being collected and tracked, particularly data relevant to *Models for Change*. These include a range of “kid level” data elements and outcome measures, as well as broader process measures tied to the Change Package Components discussed earlier. The tables displayed in Appendix A offer a preliminary look at the range and types of data that are likely to be collected and tracked during the pilot phase.

The WSCCR and NCJJ will continue to work with the Juvenile Court and the Center for Children and Youth Justice (in addition to CWLA and the Georgetown University Center for Juvenile Justice Reform), to ensure that all relevant data are being compiled and analyzed. Again, one of the important aspects of the KC-SII is, ultimately, to provide a model for other sites to emulate as they attempt to tackle the unique challenges associated with multi-system cases.

What is the status of the pilot program?

As of early March 2009, ten dual system cases were involved in the pilot program. Not surprisingly, the numbers are growing slowly as the Kent District DCFS and juvenile probation unit supervisors review and assign cases. At present, any dual system case in the area is considered eligible. Again, these cases often present a range of serious challenges including histories of school failure, mental illness, substance abuse, serious child maltreatment, and other adverse childhood experiences.

Because of these problems and the difficulties that systems have traditionally faced in trying to address them, cross system cases are much more likely to experience a range of negative outcomes. Nevertheless, if King County can be successful in decreasing these young people’s re-offending rates, can decrease the frequency of placement changes these juveniles’ often experience (including detention stays and runaways), and can produce more positive outcomes for these children as they move out of the child welfare and juvenile justice systems, the benefits will be far-reaching and substantial.

How are the kids and families faring so far?

While it is too soon to determine if the pilot project is achieving the desired results, important progress is being made. The systemic changes and process improvements that are occurring between DCFS and juvenile probation are promising and should not be undervalued. It is evident that, on the ground level, DCFS social workers and juvenile probation officers in the Kent District are paying closer attention than ever to their dual system cases. They are coordinating case plans and communicating on a regular basis, they are meeting regularly to discuss mutual concerns as the pilot program moves forward, and they are trying to show that joint case management and cooperation can alter the negative pathways that too many cross-over youth experience.

King County will continue to carefully track a wide range of kid-based measures and outcomes and, over time, the court and its key partners will be able to evaluate the impact of the King County Systems Integration Initiative. NCJJ, in close consultation with WSCCR and the Lead Entity in Washington State, will continue to appropriately monitor the status of this important *Models for Change* effort.¹⁵

What next?

Initial planning is under way to expand the pilot project to other sites in King County. Selection of the next site or sites will follow the same thoughtful process used to select the Kent region. Countywide data from the multi-system prevalence study should offer important insights and should help with selection of subsequent sites. The cross-agency dynamics found within specific DCFS and juvenile probation units, and unit leadership considerations, will also be keys in subsequent site selection.

King County will continue to work closely with CWLA and the Georgetown Center for Juvenile Justice Reform to ensure that the Breakthrough Series Collaborative approach is adhered to, that data collection and tracking of case outcomes are accurate and thorough, and that the levels of cooperation between DCFS and juvenile probation continue to progress to help improve the lives of dual system youth and their families.

For additional information on the King County Systems Integration Initiative, please contact Marcus Stubblefield at marcus.stubblefield@kingcounty.gov.

Endnotes

- ¹ Throughout this paper, unless otherwise specified, reference to “cross-over,” “dually-involved,” “dual system,” “dual jurisdiction,” and/or “multi-system” youth refers to youth with co-occurring involvement in the child welfare and juvenile justice systems.
- ² For examples go to the following sources: <http://www.cwla.org/programs/juvenilejustice/jdnewsletter.htm>; www.abanet.org/youthatrisk/crossoveryouthpolicy.html; www.cwla.org/programs/juvenilejustice/thelink2006Summer.pdf
- ³ The *Arizona Dual Jurisdiction Study*, conducted by NCJJ, found comparable re-offending rates for boys and girls who experienced dual system (dependency/delinquency) involvement in that state. This stands in marked contrast to long-standing gender differences in re-offending or recidivism rates, with such rates typically being substantially higher for male juveniles compared to female juveniles. Go to www.cwla.org/programs/juvenilejustice/AZExecSummary.pdf
- ⁴ CWLA and the Center for Juvenile Justice Reform are members of the MacArthur Foundation’s National Resource Bank (NRB), a group of national experts that provide technical assistance to sites participating in the *Models for Change* juvenile justice systems reform initiative. For more information on *Models for Change*, go to <http://www.modelsforchange.net>
- ⁵ A one-day “snapshot” count of cross-system cases, taken on December 31, 2008, indicated there were eight cases on that date that met the target population criteria in the Kent District. Source: *Overall Measures Template* (dated 1/06/09) provided by the King County Systems Integration Initiative Project Coordinator.
- ⁶ Becca cases generally equate to status offender cases.
- ⁷ Subsequent study phases are anticipated that could expand the analyses beyond cross system involvement in the child welfare and juvenile justice systems – for example, eventually, subsequent analysis may more closely examine youth involvement with the mental health system.
- ⁸ There are additional subcomponents but a limited number of examples are provided here for brevity’s sake.
- ⁹ The reasons behind such long-standing policies are complex but, ultimately, stem from the traditional barriers (communicative, professional, and otherwise) that have impeded cross-agency cooperation and coordination.
- ¹⁰ It should also be noted that King County is not the first jurisdiction to implement policy changes intended to reduce detention stays for dual system youth. For example, see G. Siegel and R. Lord. *When Systems Collide: Improving Court Practices and Programs in Dual Jurisdiction Cases* – go to <http://www.ncjservehttp.org/NCJJWebsite/pdf/dualjurisdiction.pdf>. Also go to cjjr.georgetown.edu/pdfs/Winter09_CrossoverPartII.pdf for more recent summaries of cross-system innovations. However, what does distinguish the King County reform effort is the manner in which they have adapted and implemented the BSC and PDSA systems change models to launch changes in a number of key policy and practice areas.
- ¹¹ As of May 2009, implementation of the System Educator component had been put on hold for a variety of reasons including administrative, budget, and other considerations. While at least some key stakeholders continue to believe that the System Educator component holds merit for the KC-SII, it appears unlikely that it will be implemented during the current Breakthrough Series Collaborative timetable.
- ¹² Some of the Change Package Components noted in these examples refer to the more specific subcomponents described earlier.
- ¹³ This preliminary analysis was conducted by the two unit supervisors and included youth with any type of dual system involvement, not just youth who had formal involvement in the dependency and offender systems. Subsequently, eligibility for the pilot project was limited to youth who do have formal cross-system involvement (i.e., adjudicated for both dependency and offender matters).
- ¹⁴ Many dual system youth experience frequent out of home placements. NCJJ’s research in Arizona, for example, found that dual jurisdiction youth averaged almost 11 placement changes during their involvement with the juvenile court system. Reducing placement changes and establishing some form of residential stability for these young people represent two important challenges for systems integration efforts across the country.
- ¹⁵ For quick reference, Appendix B contains a series of tables that outline some of the more important changes in policies and practices that have been implemented in the pilot program. These tables offer an “at a glance” overview of these system reforms.

APPENDIX A – Preliminary List of Possible Data to be Tracked for the KC-SII Pilot Program¹

I. Process Related Measures

Type of Measure	Measure of Cross-System Data Collection and Funding
Measure #1	Number of cross-over youth identified by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Race/Ethnicity • Gender • Age
Terms to Define/Identify	Common definition of race (use Children’s Administration/CA list) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marry with juvenile justice (jj) staff, summarize CA list with JJWEB list Identification of cross-over youth in the target site
Collection Mechanisms	Demographic sheet and checklist for each child placed in case file. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Compare current case lists to ID cross-over youth <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At what stage of the process are youth officially tracked? • Do we track all youth? 2. How do we identify new cases?
Tracking Mechanism	Spreadsheet
Collection Date	Weekly (How often do we collect data internally)?

Type of Measure	Measures of Workers Understanding and Ability to do Cross-System Assessment and Case Planning Work
Measure #2	Number of cross-over youth who are jointly assessed using assessment and case plan tools
Terms to Define/Identify	The following is a way to determine use of joint assessment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Name/ID # of cross-over youth in target site • Number of cross-over youth in target site • Number of cross-over youth who were jointly assessed using a common tool
Collection Mechanisms	A data field will be added to the spreadsheet to record whether a joint assessment occurred and when Separate assessment tools, 1 joint interview Without Information System, collection will be done by head count
Tracking Mechanism	The data person will run a monthly query to capture the number of cross-over youth that have been jointly assessed (common assessment tool) If hand count the data person will go into the file and count the number of assessments completed for cross over youth using joint assessment tool
Collection Date	Query run the last Friday of the month

Type of Measure	Measures of Workers Understanding and Ability to do Cross-System Assessment and Case Planning Work
Measure #3	Number/Percentage of SW/PO who report access to cross-agency client and case data
Terms to Define/Identify	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of cross-over youth in the target site • Names/ID# of cross-over youth • Cross agency client and case data
Collection Mechanisms	Monthly checklist to SW/PO asking if they have access to cross-over agency client and case data
Tracking Mechanism	Data person compiles checklist
Collection Date	Last Friday of the month

Type of Measure	Measures of Workers Understanding and Ability to do Cross-System Assessment and Case Planning Work
Measure #4	Number/Percentage of SW/PO who report knowing the identity of and how to contact their counterparts working with the same family
Terms to Define/Identify	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Names/ID# of cross-over youth Mechanism to identify all SW/PO working with cross-over youth Counterparts working with the same family
Collection Mechanisms	Monthly checklist to SW/PO asking if they know the name of their counterparts
Tracking Mechanism	Data person compiles checklist
Collection Date	Last Friday of the month

Type of Measure	Measures of Workers Understanding and Ability to do Cross-System Assessment and Case Planning Work
Measure #5	Number/Percentage of case plans developed for cross-over youth that actively engage cross-over youth and their families in planning for services
Terms to Define/Identify	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Names/ID# of cross-over youth Number/Percentage of case plans developed for cross-over youth Definition of family engagement: (ways to define ?) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Youth was present during the case planning process Family was present during the case planning process Youth was asked his/her opinion about the kinds of services that would be most helpful as reported by youth Family was asked his/her opinion about the kinds of services that would be most helpful as reported by family <p>*Were these services helpful? (FTDM, joint/shared case planning) Scaling of 1-5 has to be defined</p>
Collection Mechanisms	Phone calls to youth and parents of children who had case plans completed in the past month, to ask if they felt that they were actively engaged in the process
Tracking Mechanism	Documentation on spreadsheet including: Did families believe they were engaged? Why or why not? Did the youth believe they were engaged? Why or why not? On a scale of 1-5 depict the quality of the engagement (1-5)
Collection Date	Following each case plan that was developed for the cross-over youth (within one day)

Type of Measure	Measure of Cross-System Data Collection and Funding
Measure #6	Number/Percentage of cases receiving joint funding
Terms to Define/Identify	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number/Percentage of cross-over youth Identification of services that are funded by child welfare and juvenile justice (who paid for services) Number/Percentage of cross-over youth receiving those services
Collection Mechanisms	Case record review (?) Financial mapping
Tracking Mechanism	Data person will review the information and generate a report for the team
Collection Date	Compile information monthly

Type of Measure	Measures of Engagement of Families in Case Planning and Decision Making Process
Measure #7	Number/Percentage of youth and families that report satisfaction with services delivered
Terms to Define/Identify	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identification of the cross-over youth in the target site Definition of satisfied with services (create a scale)
Collection Mechanisms	SW/Probation ask the questions to families at the next appt.
Tracking Mechanism	Team data person to receive information from SW/PO
Collection Date	Compile information monthly

II. Outcome Related Measures

Type of Measure	Measure of Child Well Being
Measure #8	Number/Percentage of cross-over youth of color, who are disproportionately represented in the juvenile justice/child welfare system at various decision points (i.e. intake, detention, substantiation, adjudication, placement)
Terms to Define/Identify	For purposes of this measure we will focus on detention admissions for cross-over youth
Collection Mechanisms	JJ day-to-day manager will submit a bi-weekly admissions report of detention center entries that includes name, birth date, and race/ethnicity to the CW day-to-day manager. The day-to-day manager will compare this list with the fam-link generated list of current youth in care to identify the cross-over youth
Tracking Mechanism	The data team will utilize a spreadsheet that delineates the population of cross-over youth based on race/ethnicity to the youth in our target site that were admitted into detention facility. Analysis will indicate the disproportionate representation of children of color
Collection Date	Bi monthly reporting

Type of Measure	Measure of Child Well Being
Measure #9	Number/Percentage of institutional placements (i.e. residential care, group care, detention)
Terms to Define/Identify	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of names/ID #s of cross-over youth in the target site • Placements of cross-over youth from the target site in a group care facility
Collection Mechanisms	Information system query
Tracking Mechanism	Information system management report
Collection Date	Last day of the month

Type of Measure	Measure of Enhanced Interagency Collaboration
Measure #10	Number/Percentage of services identified within the joint assessment of cross-over youth that are actually provided
Terms to Define/Identify	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Names of cross-over youth in target site • Number/Percentage of case plans jointly developed • Number/Percentage of services identified in joint case plan • Definition of “service provision” • Number/Percentage of services provided
Collection Mechanisms	A data field will be added to the information system indicating the use of a common case planning tool. Brief monthly checklist for SW/PO of cross-over youth-asking is services that were identified were actually provided MOU to share assessments with workers to create a joint case plan and services
Tracking Mechanism	The data person will run a monthly query to capture the number of assessments for cross-over youth using a common assessment tool (To be created)
Collection Date	Last Friday of the month

III. Preliminary examples of “Baseline Data” for the Kent District Dual System Youth Pilot Program

NOTE: The following tables reflect possible “baseline” data for cases being considered for the Kent District Pilot Project. The numbers presented reflect one-day point-in-time “snapshot” counts for December 31, 2008.² The differences in counts between the Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice baseline data tables reflect a number of factors. These include different numbers of cases being screened for possible inclusion in the pilot program by each agency, as well as different types of baseline data being tracked by each agency. As the KC-SII and the Kent District pilot program move forward, it is likely that this preliminary listing will be modified. King County is also tracking these data by age.

Note: data that are planned for tracking but not yet available are indicated in the following 3 data tables with [...].

Table 1 – Child Welfare System Baseline Data

	Total #	# Males	Afr Am	Latino	Asian	Cauc	Native	Other
1. Referrals/Cases (i.e., referrals accepted for assessment)	98	56	35	8	2	50	1	2
2. Type of Placement/Current Living Situation								
a. No Out-of-Home Placements (Home)	17	7	5	2	0	8	1	1
b. Kinship/Relative	27	15	8	3	0	15	0	1
c. Foster Care	32	21	11	2	2	17	0	0
d. Congregate Care	20	11	8	2	0	10	0	0
e. Other:	2	2	1	0	0	0	1	1
3. Permanency Goals								
a. Remain at home	17	7	5	2	0	8	1	1
b. Reunification	14	9	2	2	2	8	0	0
c. Adoption	3	1	0	0	0	3	0	0
d. Guardianship	18	11	6	0	0	12	0	0
e. Permanent Planned Living Arrangements	46	26	21	4	0	19	0	2
4. Number of youth that aged-out of the child welfare system

Table 2 – Juvenile Justice System Baseline Data³

	Total #	# Males	Afr Am	Latino	Asian	Cauc	Native	Other
1. Referrals/Arrests/Complaints	196	151	50	14	14	115	3	...
2. Pre-Adjudication Detention	8	8	6	2
3. Diversion/Informal Adjustments	369	240	56	49	33	7	8	...
4. Petition to Court	202	144	68	33	10	75	12	4
5. Type of Disposition								
a. Dismissed
b. Home on Probation	170	133	57	29	3	70	7	4
c. Congregate Care
d. Correctional Institution--County	8	8	2	3	2	0	1	0
e. Correctional Alternative-County	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
f. Correctional Institution--State	26	26	8	2	3	9	1	3
g. Other:

Table 3 – Crossover Youth Baseline Data

	Total #	# Males	African American	Latino	Asian	Caucasian	Native
1. How many youth in the target population meet the definition of your target population?	8	5	3	1	0	3	0
2. How many of these youth (D1) were detained in a pre-adjudication detention facility at the time of the arrest?	3	0	3	0	0	0	0
3. How many of these youth were not charged (i.e., charges were dropped/not pursued)?
4. How many of these youth received diversion/informal adjustments?
5. How many of these youth were petitioned to delinquency court?	8	5	3	1	0	3	0
6. How many of these youth received the following dispositions?	8	5	3	1	0	3	0
a. Home on Probation	8	5	3	1	0	3	0
b. Congregate Care
c. Correctional Institution--County
d. Correctional Alternative-County
e. Correctional Institution--State
f. Other: _____
7. How many of these youth are living in any of the following under child protective services at the time of the juvenile justice disposition?	8	5	3	1	0	3	0
a. No Placement Under CPS (e.g., correctional setting)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b. Home	3	3	0	1	0	2	0
c. Kinship/Relative	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
d. Foster Care	2	1	1	0	0	1	0
e. Congregate Care	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
f. Other: _____	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8. What is the Child Welfare permanency goal for these youth at the time of the juvenile justice disposition?	8	5	3	1	0	3	0
a. Remain at home	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b. Reunification	4	3	1	1	0	2	0
c. Adoption	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
d. Guardianship	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
e. Alternative Permanent Planned Living Arrangements	3	2	1	0	0	1	0
9. How many of these youth emancipated/aged out of the child welfare system?

Appendix B – “At a Glance” Summary Tables of Initial System Improvements Achieved in the KC-SII Pilot Program

The following tables outline some of the key improvements evident in King County’s efforts to improve case handling and outcomes for youth who have cross-system involvement in the child welfare (dependency) and juvenile justice systems.⁴ In brief, King County has implemented the “Breakthrough Series Collaborative” systems change approach, and is pilot testing that approach in the Kent District, to prompt system improvements for dual system cases. While the King County pilot project is in its early stages, some important changes are evident. However, the contents of this document should be viewed as a “point in time” overview that will be updated as the pilot project continues to evolve.

Change in policy/practice	When implemented?	Reasons for change	Possible benefit/impact	Comments
1. DCFS Social Workers are pre-approved to visit youth in detention.	October 2008	Previous policy required social workers to request approval from probation supervisor, delayed release from detention.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Decrease prolonged and unnecessary detention stays, particularly for cross-system youth in foster care. 2. Improved communication between DCFS and juvenile probation staff. 3. Immediate access to detention will expedite services and placement. 4. Relieve extra work for detention staff and probation counselors. 5. Expedite case planning. 	Previous research shows cross-over youth tend to have prolonged detention stays and frequent placement changes.

Change in policy/practice	When implemented?	Reasons for change	Possible benefit/impact	Comments
2. Allow youth to be transported via taxi to the Kent DCFS office NOTE: Only for youth not considered runaway risks.	November 2008	Prior to change, assigned social workers had to travel 25 miles each way upon a youth’s release from detention. The entire process, including travel, often took 3 to 4 hours further delaying placement and services planning.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reduce time in detention. 2. Provide more time for assigned social workers to plan for and arrange post-detention placement and services. 3. Provide more time for social workers to assist other clients. 	DCFS estimates this option has been used on at least 20 occasions with no runaway incidents at the time of transport.

Change in policy/practice	When implemented?	Reasons for change	Possible benefit/impact	Comments
3. Hold monthly joint meetings with DCFS and probation staff.	September 2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To provide cross system training on interagency systems integration protocols and information sharing. • To eliminate barriers between the two systems and promote better understanding of each system’s limitations. • To build joint case planning process. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reduce conflicts between agencies. 2. Increase adherence to systems integration protocols and policies. 3. Increase frequency of joint case planning. 4. Increase frequency of joint case assessment. 5. Increase frequency of coordinated case management. 	Cross system training continues on a regular basis to achieve consistent implementation of policies and procedures.

Change in policy/practice	When implemented?	Reasons for change	Possible benefit/impact	Comments
4. DCFS and probation provide lists of each system's active cases on a monthly basis, and assign a single point of contact person in each agency to determine if an open case has any history with the other system.	This was implemented early on in 2007 in conjunction with the KC-SII protocols. In November 2008, the juvenile intake supervisor was granted access to the child welfare agency's computer system.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frequent delays in determining cross system involvement or history. • Until change, there was no direct access to automated case records across the two agencies. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Quickly determine dual system involvement and/or cross-over history. 2. Juvenile probation now has direct access to DCFS automated system, allowing for prompt identification of dual involvement. 3. DCFS to eventually have direct access to probation's automated system (JJWEB). 	The pilot DCFS and probation units also have up to date listings of their counterparts phone numbers and email addresses. This has further improved communication between the units and promoted coordination of services.

Change in policy/practice	When implemented?	Reasons for change	Possible benefit/impact	Comments
5. DCFS/Probation job shadowing.	Pending. It is always available if social workers or probation officers want to shadow their counterparts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To gain full understanding of the roles, resources, and limitations of each system. • To further improve working relationships between agencies. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Promote better understanding of what each agency can and cannot do. 2. Improve knowledge of the resources at each agency's disposal. 	

Appendix Notes

¹ NCJJ has reviewed an initial example of the "Baseline Data" spreadsheet prepared by King County officials (see page 22 for an example). This spreadsheet contains a more extensive delineation of specific data elements that are being considered for "before and after" comparison measurements of initiative impact.

² Source: *Overall Measures Template* (dated 1/06/09) provided by the King County Systems Integration Initiative Project Coordinator.

³ The numbers of referrals, arrests, and complaints exceed the actual number of juveniles because many of these cases experienced multiple events.

⁴ Prior to becoming involved in the Breakthrough Systems Collaborative approach, the KC-SII developed several working agreements and protocols. These included a comprehensive information-sharing guide and comprehensive systems integration case assessment, case planning, and case management protocols.