

Community Facilities for Juvenile Offenders in Washington State

APPENDICES

December 1998

Christopher Murray & Associates
M. M. Bell, Inc.

The Washington State Institute for Public Policy
110 East Fifth Avenue, Suite 214
PO Box 40999
Olympia, WA 98504-0999

Telephone: (360) 586-2677
Fax: (360) 586-2793
URL: <http://www.wa.gov/wsipp>
Document Number: 98-12-1201A

WASHINGTON STATE INSTITUTE FOR PUBLIC POLICY

MISSION

The Washington Legislature created the Washington State Institute for Public Policy in 1983. A Board of Directors—representing the legislature, the governor, and public universities—governs the Institute, hires the director, and guides the development of all activities.

The Institute's mission is to carry out practical research, at legislative direction, on issues of importance to Washington State. The Institute conducts research activities using its own policy analysts, academic specialists from universities, and consultants. New activities grow out of requests from the Washington legislature and executive branch agencies, often directed through legislation. Institute staff work closely with legislators, as well as legislative, executive, and state agency staff to define and conduct research on appropriate state public policy topics.

Current assignments include projects in welfare reform, criminal justice, education, youth violence, and social services.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Senator Karen Fraser
Senator Jeanine Long
Senator Valoria Loveland
Senator James West
Representative Ida Ballasiotes
Representative Jeff Gombosky
Representative Helen Sommers
Representative Steve Van Luven

Lyle Quasim, Department of Social and Health Services
Dick Thompson, Office of Financial Management
David Dauwalder, Central Washington University
Jane Jervis, The Evergreen State College
Marsha Landolt, University of Washington
Thomas L. "Les" Purce, Washington State University
Ken Conte, House Office of Program Research
Stan Pynch, Senate Committee Services

STAFF

Roxanne Lieb, Director
Steve Aos, Associate Director

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: Reports on Individual Facilities

Aloha House	A-1
Canyon View Group Home	A-7
Excelsior Youth Center	A-13
Fort Simcoe Job Corps	A-19
Griffin Home	A-23
Jessie Dyslin's Boys Ranch	A-29
Morning Star Boys Ranch	A-35
Oakridge Community Reintegration Program	A-41
Our Sister's House	A-47
Parke Creek Group Home	A-53
Puget Sound Center	A-57
Ridgeview Group Home	A-63
Riverview Youth Center	A-69
Ruth Dykeman Children's Center	A-75
Safeco Safe House	A-81
Secret Harbor School	A-87
Selma R. Carson Home	A-93
Sunrise Group Home	A-101
Touchstone Group Home	A-107
Twin Rivers Group Home	A-115
Woodinville Treatment Center	A-121
Woodlawn Faith Home	A-125

APPENDIX B: Forms Used in the Study B-1

APPENDIX C: JRA Forms Referenced in the Report..... C-1

ALOHA HOUSE SEATTLE, WASHINGTON

FACILITY AND NEIGHBORHOOD DESCRIPTION

Aloha House is a small community residential facility located on Capital Hill in Seattle Washington. The program, which only serves girls, is operated by the YMCA of Greater Seattle. The primary focus of the program is on building transition skills for older girls (generally ages 16 to 18) as they move into a community setting. The program is currently licensed for eight residents, although an expansion of the license to 12 was pending at the time of the site visit. JRA contracts for up to eight beds, four of which are guaranteed. When licensed for 12 beds the program will have eight JRA beds, two beds for girls referred by the King County Department of Youth Services, and two "community beds." The community beds will generally be used for homeless girls. Prior to serving JRA youth, the facility provided similar services to DCFS referrals. Seven girls were in residence on the day of the site visit.

The facility is a large, three-story wood frame house located on a corner lot on an arterial not far from Volunteer Park. The main floor consists of a living room, dining room, kitchen, and office. The upper two stories have a total of six bedrooms. Most of these bedrooms are very large; all are large enough for two residents. A daylight basement has a laundry room, storage room, and recreation room. The program manager said that the recreation room is not used very much.

There is also a former "coach house" at the back of the property, off the alley. This building has been converted into a group room and offices for counselors. A small studio apartment above the offices and group room is used by a university student who acts as the on-call person on the graveyard shift. The student also takes one shift per month. These services are provided in exchange for rent.

The immediate neighborhood consists of well-maintained, large, expensive older homes. According to the realtor's flyer on a house for sale across the street, the asking price was \$549,950. Despite the up-scale nature of much of the neighborhood, it was reported that there are five group homes within three blocks.

FACILITY SECURITY

Aloha House has one of the best community residential facility security systems we saw this summer. Windows and exterior doors all have unobtrusive sensors that set off an alarm in the office if the door is opened or if the window is opened beyond a certain amount. (Windows can be opened a few inches for ventilation, but not far enough for egress.) There is also a motion detector on each side of the house that reports if anyone tries to approach from any direction other than the front door. The porch at the front door has an unobtrusive sensor that alerts staff when someone is there.

The program uses written agreement forms with schools and employers. This is a new innovation, brought about by a JRA initiative. It was reported that there have been a few problems with compliance by community colleges. Some employers were also lost when JRA residents were restricted from participation in large events. In particular, girls who worked at concession stands at the Kingdome were no longer allowed to work there.

STAFFING

The program operates with seven full-time staff and six part-time staff. A minimum of two employees are on duty during the day and evening shifts every day of the week. On weekdays there is usually another staff person on duty who does not have direct supervisory responsibility over the residents. A therapist or social worker is also on site for part of most weekday evenings. On the graveyard shift there is one awake staff on duty plus an on-call person who lives in a studio apartment on the site.

The average full-time employee at Aloha House has worked there for a little over four years. The average part-time employee has worked there for nearly three years. Because the program is relatively new to the business of providing services to juvenile offenders, neither the full-time or part-time staff have as much experience working with juvenile offenders as with adolescents in general.

COMMUNITY RISK ASSESSMENT

Community risk assessments are conducted during formal staffing meetings that take place each Wednesday at the facility. The CRP Coordinator attends these meetings. Because almost all staff who have dealings with the residents are in attendance, knowledge about the youth's behavior on and off site should be readily available to inform the risk assessment process.

The original community risk assessment form is filed in the youth's legal file at the JRA regional office. A copy is filed in the youth's on-site case file. Case files for two girls were reviewed during the site visit. In both files, copies of community risk assessments were up to date and completed according to the required 90 day review schedule.

VIOLATIONS AND INFRACTIONS

Aloha House reports violations of rules through its incident reporting system. As with other incident reporting systems seen this summer, the system used at Aloha House records incidents other than rule violations and infractions. Incident reports are kept in a master file; copies are filed in the appropriate case files. The master file of incident reports was reviewed during the site visit. The file was well organized and in chronological order. The incident report form was changed at the end of 1997 but, because there were so few incidents at Aloha House, incidents were tabulated and categorized for the period from January 1997 through June 1998. The old form did not identify the resident other than by name. As a result, it is not possible to know how many incidents involved JRA girls, and how many involved placements from other organizations.

INCIDENT REPORTS: January 1997 through June 1998

Type of Incident	Number
Run	4
Late return	1
Behavior – verbal	3
Smoking	2
Not an infraction	1
Total	11

According to survey data collected by the Washington State Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP), 15 JRA youth were referred to Aloha House in FY97. Of these, two were returned to institutions. This is a significantly below-average return rate. The Aloha House self-assessment report on returns to JRA for violation of rules agrees with the JRA data.

Aloha House uses a level system to encourage good behavior and discourage unacceptable behavior.

ESCAPE PROCEDURES

Aloha House defines escape as any time a resident may not be found, or where there is unaccounted-for time, for more than 15 minutes. Procedures specify that JRA, police, family, and the program administrator be notified.

According to JRA data, there were no escapes from Aloha House in FY97. There was one in FY 98. The Aloha House self-assessment report on escapes agrees with the JRA data.

VISITING

Visiting takes place in the evening. There is a one-hour visiting period on Sundays through Thursdays and a two-hour visiting period on Fridays and Saturdays. Visits take place in the public spaces of the house. Visits must be scheduled at least one day in advance. Visitors are required to show positive identification. Non-family visitors must first be approved by the resident's primary youth worker. Staff do not continuously monitor all visits.

The number, type, and frequency of visitors a resident may have depends on the resident's level. At the lowest level, a resident may have one visit per week from approved family members. At the two highest levels, a resident may also have visits from approved friends.

JRA MONITORING

JRA conducts formal reviews of Aloha House once a year. The most recent review examined by the consultant was conducted in the spring of 1997 and forwarded to the program in November 1997. The program was going through a period of considerable transition during this time, including a change in program director, house manager, and some staff. These changes were, from the perspective of JRA, all for the better. A number of corrective actions were cited in this report, including the need to develop policy and procedure for on-site checks of residents, changes to the security log, and development of new incident report forms. From review during the site visit this summer, it appears that these corrective actions have been completed.

The program manager reported that the current CRP Coordinator is at the facility at least three hours per week. This is consistent with the CRP Coordinator's estimate of four to five hours per week, or as he put it, "some weeks more; some weeks less." From the program's perspective, there is great inconsistency in this part of the JRA monitoring process. The current CRP Coordinator was said to be the third person in this position in the last year.

The current CRP Coordinator for Aloha House is also the CRP Coordinator for two other programs in the Seattle area. While none of these programs is large, each is very different from the others. This presumably complicates the task of finding referrals and recruits for the CRPs. It also means that there are three different groups of staff that the CRP Coordinator must get to

know and develop working relationships with. It also means that there are three sets of staff meetings to attend.

RELATIONS WITH THE COMMUNITY

It was reported that there is very little contact with (or, for that matter, among) neighbors. Aloha House held an open house in May 1998 that was attended by only one neighbor. An earlier attempt to start a block watch program failed for lack of interest.

The YMCA, of course, has a board of directors which includes community members. An 11-member Youth and Family Services Committee oversees Aloha House and similar programs. This committee is responsible for policy, program and budget review. It does not get involved in placement decisions or day-to-day matters of operation.

Schools

Because its target population is older girls, most residents at Aloha House who are involved in education attend community college, rather than high school. There were no residents in high school at the time we toured the facility.

Successful contact was made with only one community college professor. She noted that use of the School Involvement Agreement forms started "three or four [academic] quarters ago."

The professor reported that site checks on the Aloha House student in her class were made by telephone. Because of class schedules and various commitments, she found these calls to be inconvenient and awkward. As she put it, "This is college ... I don't want to deal with people about a student without the student's presence." She expressed a preference for Aloha House staff to come to the school for meetings with both the professor and the student.

Employers

There were no employers identified for residents of Aloha House.

Justice System Representatives

A public information officer from the Seattle Police Department checked with the Community Service Officer in charge of the area where Aloha House is located. According to the Community Service Officer, no specific problems have occurred at this address in recent years. In her words, it is "not a trouble spot."

The Juvenile Court and Juvenile Probation Department place some girls at Aloha House as part of the county's Alternatives to Secure Detention program. Their assessment of the program was very positive. Unless there is new criminal behavior, the Juvenile Court and Juvenile Probation have no contact with JRA clients at the facility.

Neighbors

Surveys were sent to the 17 addresses nearest to Aloha House. Seven surveys were returned. In general, the assessment of neighbors was positive. On a five point scale ranging from excellent to very poor, one neighbor rated the group home as an "excellent neighbor," one as a "very poor neighbor," one as an "average neighbor." The other four respondents rated the facility a "good neighbor."

The neighbor who rated the facility an “average neighbor” complained about the facility’s handling of garbage and “gutter overflow” which sends water onto their property. This person said, “We have never had any problems with the individual residents of Aloha House. However, as next door neighbors we have had periodic problems with their upkeep and maintenance of their property.” “Unsanitary and unsightly” garbage disposal was said to be common. The writer also was unhappy about conversion of a garage into office space and an apartment and the digging of a trench for a water line that damaged the roots of trees on their property, “without even consulting us.”

The neighbor who rated the facility a “very poor neighbor” complained of yard maintenance, loud music, and conversion of the garage into an office and apartment. The latter was cited as reducing parking availability in the neighborhood and creation of “what I believe is an illegal apartment in the garage.”

OTHER ISSUES

It was reported that a donor gave the facility to the YMCA with the expectation that it be used for group care. As a result, the YMCA owns the building free and clear. While the YMCA has made significant improvements to the building, the absence of a mortgage is an important factor in making a program of this small size work financially.

Aloha House also shares services (counselors, social workers, etc.) with two other programs run by the YMCA of Greater Seattle. This further helps reduce the per-capita cost of these services.

CANYON VIEW GROUP HOME EAST WENATCHEE, WASHINGTON

FACILITY AND NEIGHBORHOOD DESCRIPTION

Canyon View Group Home is a 16-bed male facility operated by JRA. As a Division of Alcohol and Substance Abuse Certified Recovery House program, it continues chemical dependency treatment started at Parke Creek or in the institutions. Counselors and their supervisor are certified chemical dependency counselors.

Referrals and population has been down since the David Dodge incident. It was reported that for a "long period," they saw no referrals. Normally they have about 40 a year. Some youth stay years. One has been there for more than three years.

The facility was built in 1968 for its current purpose as a JRA facility. In 1968 that meant the facility held dependent and delinquent youth. Although built with an apartment for group home parents, the facility never had them. Instead, the facility has an office where the apartment was formerly located.

This facility and Parke Creek originally had similar floor plans. The boys sleep in seven rooms off a corridor. Rooms are multiple occupancy. Most have two occupants. A staff duty station looks down the corridor and out into the living room and dining areas. Unlike Parke Creek, Canyon View's schoolroom is in the same building at the end of the kitchen and front entrance area. Other modifications and modernization at Parke Creek make the two facilities appear quite different.

The surrounding neighborhood is largely commercial or multi-occupancy residences. The program supervisor knows of only two single-family houses in their immediate neighborhood. An elderly couple occupy one house and their 60+-year-old daughter lives in the other. The facility is across the street from several public maintenance buildings and up the street from the Area Agency on Aging. Also across the street is a large park. There is a public swimming pool down the block and around the corner. The number of grade school-age youth and adults suggests that either the park runs a day-camp program in the summer, or people just make a lot of use of the park. Across from the swimming pool is the Eastmont High School.

FACILITY SECURITY

The building is a one-story, wood frame building, which gives the appearance of a residence at first glance. The number of cars in the parking lot and the eventual awareness of its size soon suggest that it is not an ordinary residence, but the casual passerby may not realize it is not a home.

Residents can exit the building in case of fire but are otherwise restricted unless staff are nearby. The doors are alarmed and quite loud. During afternoons when more youth are back from work or school, the alarm on the door to the back yard and basketball hoop is often deactivated. The teacher sometimes deactivates the alarm in the classroom in order to have air circulation.

There are fixed-pane windows in the area frequented by the residents. The only windows that open are in the staff offices, and those appear to be locked if unoccupied. Windows are not alarmed.

The exterior of the building is well lighted except for one corner near the garage. One light on the north side has a motion detector, but it was not functioning. The property is fenced across the back but not in the front. It was reported that the group home has had some problems with outsiders dropping drugs in the yard for later pickup by the residents.

There is a video camera on the front and back doors. The monitor is in the staff office; however, the office is not always manned, including at night. As an alternative, door buzzers on both doors can be heard throughout the building.

STAFFING

Staff actively supervising youth reach a peak in late afternoons. Starting at seven in the morning, there are only two staff on duty; this includes at least one, if not both, administrators. By 11 a.m., there are three and by mid-afternoon there are five. By late evening (11 p.m.), there are two, and from 12:30 a.m. to 8 a.m. there is only one staff person on duty. During the day, other staff are around: the teacher, the cook, the secretary, and occasionally the maintenance man.

During the afternoon and evening activity period, most staff take youth to meetings or check on work sites, etc. As a result, only one staff may be on duty at the facility during these times.

Staff do not drive youth to work or school, rather they walk. Staff do take youth to appointments, to AA/NA meetings, and on outings. Youth who have reached higher levels may go to AA/NA with their sponsor. The most responsible youths may go on their own.

All but one of the cars used by staff have radios so they can call in emergencies while they are off-site, performing work or school visits, taking youth to AA meetings, etc. The car without a radio has a cell phone. Staff on the graveyard shift wear panic buttons so they can call for help.

Five regular JRA counselors, one chemical dependency coordinator, one supervisor, one administrator, and nine intermittent staff maintain these staffing levels. Other staff include the cook, a senior secretary, a 16-hour-a-week maintenance man, and a full-time schoolteacher from the high school.

COMMUNITY RISK ASSESSMENT

A group, including the counselor, the resident, the supervisor, and other staff as appropriate completes community risk assessments. The staff have misgivings about the CRA. They think it is vague and easily manipulated. For example, they receive referrals whose CRA is lower than their risk. Some measures are just missing. They are especially concerned about the risk of violence.

A check of five records revealed one youth with some missing CRAs. It should be noted that these are large files and single sheets can be easy to miss. One youth was a new arrival and not due for a risk assessment. The others had the expected CRAs.

Staff felt they had good rapport with the outsiders who might contribute to risk assessment information. The vice-principal at the high school is in regular contact with staff. Students at the high school have attendance taken in every class. Canyon View residents have a weekly progress report. The employers sign a contract agreeing to report problems. Members of the

AA/NA community have learned to speak to staff when they see signs of trouble with Canyon View youth. All these data become part of the information that contributes to the CRA.

VIOLATIONS AND INFRACTIONS

Canyon View uses a modified level system. Youth progress based on time in the program more than behavior. Rather than push youth back a level, staff place them on “inactive status.” Inactive youth have their privileges frozen. Once the youth and his counselor have a plan for him to return to active status, then he goes back to the privileges he had. Serious infractions result in a return to a JRA institution. Some youth are returned temporarily.

Each level or time period has its own requirements: attendance at AA meetings, attendance at group, attendance at meetings at the Center, completion of community service, maintenance of school, work, etc. Failure to meet the level requirements is equivalent to an infraction and can result in privileges being frozen. The handbook provided to each youth emphasizes behavior instead of infractions. The handbook does not contain a list of infractions.

The resident interviewed did know of other rules. The incident log made those apparent as well. This youth said you could get in trouble for not meeting assignments (the requirements of your level) but you could also get in trouble for “goofing around,” for chewing tobacco, for horseplay. The relative consequences are also clear. Goofing around can get you sent to your room. As the resident said, “Horseplay can get you sent back to the institution.” Staff reported that return to an institution for horseplay happens only if the behavior continues and is serious enough that it victimizes other residents.

The incident logs included a range of incidents: those resulting in discipline, hospital visits, and praise for behavior in a difficult situation. Talking back to staff resulted in room restriction. Horseplay got one youth on “inactive status.” Repeated horseplay and fighting got several returned to an institution.

ESCAPE PROCEDURES

Escape is defined as not being where you are supposed to be when you are supposed to be there. They have grace period to cover circumstances beyond the youth’s control, such as a missed bus, but it is less than the four hours allowed by JRA bulletin.

If the school reports that a youth is missing a class, staff may check themselves if they know the youth well and think this might be a false alarm. Otherwise they call the Sheriff. This practice resulted from inaccurate reports by school staff stating that Canyon View youth were not in class when, in fact, they were. If an employer calls to report the youth has not appeared, staff response also depends on their knowledge of the youth.

On-site staff do counts “every couple of hours.” JRA policy specifies four hours except during sleeping hours when counts are to be every half-hour. At Canyon View, they do half-hour counts when residents are in bed.

If there is an escape, notice first goes to the Sheriff and then the Washington State Patrol. Next, they report to the regional administration for JRA. All notices of escapes go to Maple Lane, which notifies victim and witnesses, if any. Canyon View staff notify parents.

The most serious escape in recent times occurred some months ago when an older youth convinced a friend and a younger resident to escape with him. Two went out the back door while it was not alarmed, probably past youth in the yard playing basketball. They met the third youth at the mall, who was there on a pass. (These types of passes are no longer available.) The youth went to Yakima where the older boy had a child. CPS was threatening to take the child from his girlfriend who was a drug abuser. One of these boys committed three armed robberies while out and is now in prison. The others committed burglaries and had lesser penalties.

Staff believe that most escapes result from situations where a youth experiences significant additional stress. For example, a personal crisis or commission of a serious infraction for which the youth is afraid he will be caught will sometimes lead to an escape. Some come planning to escape. It was reported that most escapes have been from the school, while walking to work, or out while on pass.

VISITING

Visiting occurs on Friday evening and Saturday and Sunday afternoons. Visitors are limited to family, friends, and AA/NA sponsors. All visits are pre-approved. Non-family visitors for youth under 18 are cleared with parents. Visits are always supervised and in the public areas.

JRA MONITORING

To the knowledge of the program supervisor, JRA last did a formal performance review of their facility/program in 1995. Most of the time they feel somewhat forgotten. They have never had an unannounced visit by JRA staff. It was reported that the Assistant Secretary has been there once and spent about five minutes walking around the facility.

RELATIONS WITH THE COMMUNITY

Canyon View does not yet have an advisory board, although they are in the process of developing one. They do interact extensively with AA/NA members who sponsor their youth. They host dinners for these folks. They also hold periodic open houses. Their residents donate time for various community efforts, such as helping fire victims, filling sandbags during floods, removing graffiti, shoveling snow, etc.

Schools

Canyon View appears to have good relationships with school staff, although the school asked for changes in who went to the school following the incident in Moses Lake when a student shot and killed people there. School staff were afraid that some Canyon View youth were also dangerous. As a result, some Canyon View residents go to school at the group home. Others still attend Eastmont High.

The Vice-Principal of Eastmont High says that Canyon View staff make better parents than most. He described how they changed the approach to "short-termers," by having a teacher at the group home. The longer-term residents still go to Eastmont if they fit into the school curriculum and graduation processes.

Employers

Relationships with the employers appear to be excellent.

A Pizza Hut restaurant has employed Canyon View residents for quite a few years. The shift supervisor considers them excellent employees, “hard workers, who don’t call in sick and [who] are always on time.” One Canyon View resident has been a long-time Pizza Hut employee. He now lives independently and is an Assistant Manager.

The shift supervisor at Pizza Hut was aware of the employer agreement form required by JRA. She knew that they were to notify Canyon View if a resident was late to work or if there was a problem. She knew that group home residents were not to ride home with other employees or with customers. She described surprise checks by Canyon View staff, both in person and on the phone. She expects Pizza Hut to continue to employ Canyon View residents.

The East Wenatchee Water District is another employer. They report several years of positive experience with Canyon View residents. The youths they have employed have been punctual and have performed well. From the employer’s perspective, the staff at the group home have also been responsive.

Justice System Representatives

Sheriff Dan LaRouche spoke of regular and steady notification of new and departing residents at the group home. He described working with school and group home staff when problems arose, such as the occasional fight or other problem. He thought the home was well run. He said he and his staff “almost forget about them most of the time.”

The Juvenile Court Administrator for Douglas County reported that there is really no impact on Douglas County Juvenile Court from Canyon View. Residents are sent back to Chelan County Juvenile Detention if there is a problem.

Neighbors

Canyon View is just outside of the City of East Wenatchee. Its neighborhood is commercial and multi-family housing. Several city and county offices are located across the street. There are few single-family residences within a few blocks.

Roger Boyer, Director of the Douglas County Parks Department, is located directly across the street from the group home. He is well aware of its existence. He interacts easily with staff and would have no hesitation in calling them if he had a problem with one of the residents. He describes interactions with residents in very positive terms. For example, the residents shovel snow at his agency; in exchange, his staff snowplows their driveway.

Another public agency neighbor is the Columbia River Area Agency on Aging. Its director, John Cottrell, has a nine-year history as a neighbor of Canyon View. They have had no problems with either the residents or the staff. When there was some vandalism four or five years ago, it was initially thought it might have been by Canyon View residents, but there was found to be no connection. It is the consensus among his staff that there are no negative issues with Canyon View.

Dawn Collings, the executive director of the East Wenatchee Chamber of Commerce, is not a near neighbor but knows many of the businesses that are. She, too, is aware of Canyon View. To her knowledge, and to the knowledge of her staff, no businesses have complained about the group home or its residents.

EXCELSIOR YOUTH CENTER SPOKANE, WASHINGTON

FACILITY AND NEIGHBORHOOD DESCRIPTION

Excelsior Youth Center is a large (85-bed) community residential facility where staff provides treatment services to boys and girls. Originally a facility for girls, the Center started taking boys in the early 1990s. Its contract with the Juvenile Rehabilitation Administration (JRA) has been for 24 beds, with 12 guaranteed. They expect those numbers to drop to 8 and 4 in September.

Even at optimum numbers, JRA youth are a minority at Excelsior. The Center accepts not only youth referred as offenders from JRA but also dependent and neglected children referred by Children's Services, mentally ill children from the Mental Health Division, children needing substance abuse treatment funded by the Division of Alcohol and Substance Abuse Services, and children referred by private vendors. They also take private-pay children and juvenile offenders and dependents from Montana and Idaho.

At one time, only JRA boys were assigned to one of the 15-bed apartments for boys, known as Pine Ridge. When JRA had 24 youth in the facility, they spilled over into a second apartment. With the current numbers so low, JRA boys are now the minority. (On the day of the site visit, only one resident out of 15 was from JRA). JRA girls are also in one apartment but have always been fewer in number. There were two JRA girls in the Independent Living Unit on the day of the site visit. No one was certain whether there were JRA girls in the main complex. This confusion may result from the mixture of youth committed by JRA and youth leaving JRA without family resources who are subsequently referred back to Excelsior by Children's Services. Until the recent statutory change eliminates parole entirely, some of the latter youth are under the supervision of JRA and Children's Services simultaneously.

Located on the northwest outskirts of Spokane, the facility sits back from the street on a large 40-acre site. Its nearest neighbor is a Catholic Church. The back of the complex faces a wooded area. The front is largely protected from an arterial by trees and shrubs. The surrounding area is middle-income, single-family residential housing. Most of the houses appear to have been built about the same time Excelsior was.

The Sisters of the Good Shepherd constructed the buildings in the 1960s as a residence for wayward girls. (They had been operating such a facility for decades before that.) The sisters turned the facility over to Excelsior in 1984. The two-story concrete block buildings form an interconnected complex that included living space for the nuns, a chapel and reflectory, now being converted to other uses. In the more conventional portions of the building there is a school, "apartments" (comprised of single occupancy rooms arrayed along a narrow hall and fronted by a dayroom and kitchen), and recreational areas complete with a gym and an outdoor swimming pool.

The facility is clean, but the apartment living units are cluttered with possessions of residents. The buildings reflect their age and need repair. For example, the roof beams are deteriorating where exposed on the exterior. The grounds could also use maintenance.

For eight or nine years, Excelsior has also operated a separate facility for girls who are transitioning to Independent Living. JRA girls may or may not be housed there, depending on their need for this service.

FACILITY SECURITY

The residential areas are on the second floor of wings running off both sides of long corridors. Each set of wings and corridor form three sides of a courtyard. The effect is a series of interconnected H's. However, the building arrangement is far from being that simple. The bathrooms are sometimes bridges between wings and sometimes are located above another hallway. The same is true for the second story corridor and apartment wings. Some are open underneath and some are enclosed.

The recreational building and play field are to one side of the residential and program buildings. A sidewalk connects the two. Management is giving serious thought to fencing that would separate the sidewalk and adjoining grounds from the parking area, i.e., enclose the bottom of each H and connect them with the recreation building.

Classrooms and staff office/work areas are under some portions of the living area. Part of the program space is in a separate part of the building that sits between two living areas. Put simply, there are no clear sight lines. Once youth leave the immediate vicinity of their living, program, or recreation area, they can quickly disappear from staff's view.

The apartments inside the complex each have 15 individual sleeping rooms. The room adjacent to the living room is a quiet room. Rooms are furnished with bed and closet. Each apartment has a large common bathroom. Private shower stalls are provided. Each apartment has a living room, kitchen, and a small staff room that looks into the living area.

Each sleeping room door is alarmed so that youth cannot leave the room without alerting staff with an audible sound. The alarm also appears on a "board" that indicates which room was opened. The windows in the apartments are designed to open no more than four inches. In practice, none of the ones we tried opened at all. Another apartment previously used by JRA youth was retrofitted with a sliding bar that prevented windows from opening too far but would release to permit egress in case of fire. Each apartment has 48 windows, two in each sleeping room and the remainder in the bathrooms and living area. The door into the apartment is locked to prevent unauthorized entrance but does not prevent egress.

Exterior doors are locked at all times but pop open when there is a fire. Otherwise, youth move outside the facility only when staff are present to unlock the doors. The exception to this practice is the front door, which is never locked. The front door opens into a waiting area. Movement on the building side of the waiting area is controlled. During normal working hours, staff is immediately adjacent to the waiting area. The exterior of the buildings is lighted on all sides. The main property is fenced but has an opening at the driveway.

Staff are concerned that adding more cameras and alarms will work against their efforts to "normalize" the youth's experience. This is especially true in the independent living facility.

The independent living facility is a split-level, two-story, wood frame house typical of others in the neighborhood. It is located about three blocks down the street from the main facility. The house has three bedrooms on the main floor, one used by the staff and the others shared by two residents. The lower level has room for five more. The residents share the living room and kitchen. The original dining room is the staff office. The lower level has a family room as well as laundry and garage. The house has three doors: the front door, a sliding glass door off the

eating area, and the garage exit from the lower level. The house is alarmed to prevent intrusion as well as to notify staff that someone is leaving without permission.

STAFFING

Since Excelsior is a treatment facility, each youth has both clinical and group life (custody) staff. They make up a treatment team. The treatment team reviews a youth's progress, makes decisions about next steps, and carries out the treatment plan. As part of treatment, staff meets with youths in group meetings every afternoon following school and recreation.

In a typical apartment, three group life staff are on duty from 1:30 p.m. to 11 p.m. At the same time, one person is roving the building. Between 11 p.m. and 6 a.m., one person is on duty in each apartment, and two people are roaming the building. From 6 a.m. until 9 a.m., each unit has two staff and two people roving. From 9 a.m. to 1:30 p.m. youth are in school and under other supervision. Staff are on duty at the independent living house except during normal working hours. During those hours, the residents are at work or a regular school.

Every 20 minutes, staff logs the location of each youth. As staff and youth move from one area to another, staff carries the log and continues to record youth locations. Thus, staff members playing baseball on the athletic field have their log with them and are making notes every 20 minutes.

School and medical services are on-site. The expectation is that youth will remain at the facility at all times. Rarely do youth leave campus on their own. The exceptions are the older youth who have met behavioral expectations and have jobs off campus and the residents in the independent living house.

COMMUNITY RISK ASSESSMENT

The facility director and staff supervisors have a clinical orientation. They do not like the risk assessment instrument, finding it vague and being unsure that it measures well. Their treatment planning process requires regular reviews of resident progress. All relevant staff contribute information. Given the high percentage of youth who remain on campus, there is less need to obtain information from sources outside the facility. When it was necessary, staff did not find doing so a problem.

It was reported that Excelsior staff complete only a portion of the risk assessment (items A through H) and then forward it to the CRP coordinator who finishes the assessment and scores it. They expect the form to be returned to the youth's file. However, none of the files examined during the course of the site visit had risk assessment forms in them. One file examined was for a youth who was in a fight that resulted in a return to JRA. The staff person remembered doing the CRA for this youth, but it was not in the file.

VIOLATIONS AND INFRACTIONS

Rules and sanctions are detailed in the Pine Ridge Apartment handbook. This document contains much information and could be difficult for some juveniles to follow. Excelsior also uses a level system with JRA youth.

Excelsior does not keep an incident log. Incident reports are filed with the juvenile's other records. None of this is electronic. Consequently, they cannot say how many incidents they

have involving JRA youth. They do note that JRA youth are less prone to incidents than their other youth. In part, this is because JRA youth are older and somewhat more institutionalized, but also they are typically less troubled than the other residents. It is also the case that JRA youth are returned when there is a serious incident or a series of more minor incidents. If the incident is minor, a youth loses certain privileges. They may drop a level, or working youth may be fined.

One resident was interviewed during the site visit. This was a girl in the independent living house. She knew the rules and the consequences. She was also aware of the Youth Complaint form, which she thought of as a grievance procedure. She did not think it was necessary at Excelsior.

A review of five files for JRA youth uncovered two with incidents. One youth was suspected of drug use. Another was involved in a fight and returned to JRA.

ESCAPE PROCEDURES

Escape is defined by Excelsior as a youth who is not in a designated area or one who fails to return from off-campus. Youths who are not where they should be are discovered—at the latest—when the staff person tries to make his or her next log entry every 20 minutes. Youth who are off-campus have a 30 minute grace period in which to catch the next bus. When an escape occurs in the building, staff are notified and converges on the only way out, the front door. When an escape occurs from outside the building, again they are notified, but they only follow the youth to the fence. Once the youth has failed to return or crossed the fence line, JRA-required escape procedures begin. A warrant is faxed to law enforcement. Excelsior management, JRA, and the parents are notified.

Excelsior has had a number of JRA youths escape from their complex. They noted that escapes are usually from the outdoor recreation areas. The high number of escapes prompted a JRA audit in May 1997. In that audit, JRA staff pointed out that there was no pattern to the escapes. They were occurring at the complex, from the apartments, and in the community. Since the audit, Excelsior staff have increased the frequency with which they log each youth's presence, increased the frequency of their face-to-face contacts in the community (those are now several times a week), and actually enter the sleeping areas to see if youth are breathing, etc. They note that the number of escapes is down.

JRA staff also raised issues about training of staff and their ability to anticipate escape risks. They questioned the longevity and training of staff providing direct supervision. Certainly in relationship to the longevity and maturity of staff in JRA group homes, this staff is young and moves on quickly. Management acknowledged that this staff tends to be younger, turning over every 1.5 to 2 years.

VISITING

Visiting at Excelsior's main facility takes place away from the living units. Visits must be pre-approved. Visits with friends are not approved until the youth has worked up through the level system and then the treatment team must approve the visitor. Supervision depends on the circumstances of the youth. Some have such difficult relationships with family that staff is always present. In other cases, youth and family need time alone together. Visiting is on weekend afternoons. Visits can be arranged at other times if the situation warrants it.

Residents on the lower levels get two-hour visits. Those with more privileges can have four-hour visits.

JRA MONITORING

Staff did not see their relationship with JRA as a good one. They spoke of the need for partnership and their sense that JRA staff did not keep up their end of the bargain. They did not know of a time frame for performance reviews. The last one was the one in May 1997 and was prompted by the series of escapes. They had not had an unannounced review.

They saw the last CRP coordinator infrequently—usually for about one hour a week—and not in the evenings or on weekends. The present CRP coordinator moved into his new position the week of the site visit. They would like to have the coordinator participate in the weekly team meetings but have been unsuccessful in arranging for this to happen.

They know that JRA staff have contacted schools and employers about JRA youth at Excelsior. They assume the contacts concern the youth's progress. They have no knowledge of JRA contacting neighbors or law enforcement to inquire about Excelsior youth or staff.

RELATIONS WITH THE COMMUNITY

Staff believe that most neighbors still see the facility much as it used to be: a home for wayward children. They are nervous about disabusing them of this notion. They already have some interaction with the community through the neighboring church and the neighborhood association but prefer to maintain a low profile. Since this is a large facility in a residential area, their concerns about community relations seem understandable.

They are especially resistant to using a community group to screen residents. The administrator has checked the liability issues with the facility's insurance agent who informed him that no company would cover the community board's liability for screening decisions.

FORT SIMCOE JOB CORPS WHITE SWAN, WASHINGTON

FACILITY AND NEIGHBORHOOD DESCRIPTION

Fort Simcoe Job Corps is a 220-bed facility that provides JRA with five beds. The day of the site visit there were three JRA youth. They have taken JRA youth since 1981. The facility houses both boys and girls, and its contract with JRA is for both boys and girls. The Job Corps provides all youth, whether from JRA or elsewhere, with education, work, and social skills. In order to finish their vocational program, some JRA youth remain after the conclusion of their sentence. The day of the site visit there were three such youth in residence.

Fort Simcoe residents are expected to make progress in four areas: vocational training, education, residential behavior, and center-wide behavior. All must graduate from high school or obtain a GED. They must complete a vocational training program. If they have special problems, such as a history of chemical dependency, that may impede their progress, they get help in that area as well. Staff evaluate student progress once a month, or more often if the student is having problems. Scores from the evaluation determine privileges and the intensity of staff assistance with their issues.

The facilities are older. Staff believe they were built originally by the CCC. The buildings sit on a campus next to Fort Simcoe State Park. Fort Simcoe State Park is located seven miles west of White Swan at the beginning of the foothills. It is an island in the middle of the Yakima Nation. Residents and staff may not trespass onto the Nation's land.

There are four dormitory buildings, a large school building, a dining room, buildings for the various vocational areas, an administration building, etc. Some staff live on campus in a residential area to the west of the student area. We did not see all the buildings. Each dormitory has eight sleeping rooms holding six to eight youth per room. The dormitories each have a larger room, called the annex, which has ten beds. The female population is lower than the number of beds in the dorm. The male dorms are more fully utilized.

The surrounding neighborhood is vacant land except for the adjoining park. There were a few campers in the park on the day of the site visit. The nearest residence is about three miles toward White Swan. White Swan itself is about 20 miles from Toppenish and perhaps 25 mile from Union Gap.

FACILITY SECURITY

The buildings are a mixture of concrete and wood frame. During the day, there are few locks and no alarms on the doors and windows. The grounds are lighted at night and patrolled by a private security firm. A fence separates the campus from the Yakima Nation's lands.

While in programs, JRA youth are scattered across the campus. One may be in the school building, another in a vocational program. On the day of the site visit, two were in the painting program. The school building is much like any high school; a series of classrooms, each with a teacher. The doors are not alarmed and neither are the windows. The same is true of the vocational areas. Because of the nature of most of the vocational programs, the buildings are open and work may sprawl onto the surrounding grounds. Teachers can be in the work area or busy in an adjoining office. Physical security is non-existent.

After school and vocational training, youth could be participating in activities anywhere on the campus. With permission, they may even be in nearby Fort Simcoe State Park. Most buildings are open to residents who have reason to be there. An exception is the dormitories.

Residents cannot be in the dormitories during the day. Dorms are locked. Most dorm rooms are off a long dimly lighted hall. The dorm monitor's office is in the center of this corridor. Rooms are large, with six or ten beds and sufficient area for closets, chests and even couches. Rooms are relatively neat for having so many occupants. The laundry and bathroom area separates one room (the annex) from the rest. Exits are at the end of the hall or directly out of the Annex. They are not alarmed.

STAFFING

Fort Simcoe administration designated one staff as counselor to JRA youth and as their liaison with JRA staff. He is responsible for developing their treatment plans and for monitoring their progress. Other staff teach in the academic and vocational programs and supervise dormitory activities. They also provide supervision to JRA youth—while in their programs, in the dormitories, and on outings.

During day shift, about 13 staff are on duty. This includes academic and vocational teachers. Seven are on the swing shift. Night coverage is three. Swing and night shift coverage is nearly the same on weekends as on weekdays. Day coverage is lower on the weekends. A total of 42 people are on staff.

Academic and vocational staff provide supervision during the daytime program. Academic teachers are with youth much of the time. Vocational teachers are sometimes with youth and sometimes nearby. At night youth in the dormitories are monitored by the dorm staff. Dorm staff are located in the center of the dormitory hall.

Staff are required to make hourly checks on JRA residents. When residents are free to move around the campus, they must check in with staff every hour. At night there is a duty officer posted at the entrance to the complex.

Youths leave the area in groups on planned outings with staff or alone with family or other approved escorts. Until recently, JRA residents have been given the same opportunities as other Job Corps residents. Now JRA youths have more restrictions. When on an outing with staff, they are paired with a specific staff member who remains close to the youth. They may not participate in activities out of the county. One JRA youth plays on the baseball team. Despite his positive behavior and good CRA scores, he cannot go to most games because they are played outside the county.

COMMUNITY RISK ASSESSMENT

Fort Simcoe staff do not use the Community Risk Assessment instrument. The JRA Coordinator completes the CRAs. He and the JRA liaison review progress regularly.

This is not to say that Fort Simcoe staff do not assess youth for risk. Fort Simcoe youth are assigned to counselors who work out plans with each individual. These plans cover vocational training, education, residential behavior, and center-wide behavior. Staff are grouped in teams centered on vocational training. For example, one team is chaired by the JRA liaison with

representatives from residential staff, from education, and from carpentry and painting. Staff teams review student progress every 30 days or more often if the student is having problems.

A “personal performance evaluation panel,” or PPEP, for assessments is used. This evaluation covers the four critical areas of vocational training, academics, residential behavior, and center-wide behavior. Residents with scores below nine are seen by their counselor. There may be a staffing. Certainly the team members spend time reviewing what is amiss with the youth. The day of the site visit four youth, none from JRA, were below nine points and reviewed by a staffing team. Their programs ranged from being absent from their assigned area to hygiene issues.

The PPEP information could be integrated into the CRA assessment and would add value to what is already being done.

VIOLATIONS AND INFRACTIONS

Fort Simcoe uses a level system. Residents progress through levels based on their PPEP evaluation. Levels are gained through good performance and lost through poor performance. Progress is also time based, in part because most evaluations occur monthly and also because some levels can be gained only after so many days in the previous level. Serious infractions can result in a youth being returned to JRA. Non-JRA youth are discharged from the Job Corps. Some youth return after a temporary absence. The option to return depends on the reason for discharge.

Rules and the PPEP process are clearly stated in the book on discipline and incentives. Zero tolerance violations result in authorities being notified and automatic termination. These include possession of a weapon, assault or threat of assault, possession or sale of drugs. Level II violations include fighting other than assault, theft, hazing, gang activity, a pattern of inappropriate activity, altering a UA specimen, etc. These can result in restrictions and a behavior contract, discipline, and a level drop, if not filing of charges. Level III (major) violations include being AWOL for 24 hours, use of alcohol, malicious horseplay, safety violations, etc. These violations can result in restrictions, point loss, extra duty, and fines. Level III (minor) violations are being AWOL from an assigned area, loss of temper, horseplay, smoking in restricted area, etc. Again, there are point losses, and there may restrictions. Level III (citation) violations include unexcused absences and being late, missing bed check, unhealthy hygiene, littering, gossip, horseplay, negative verbalization, etc. The penalties may include point loss and fines.

The JRA residents interviewed said they knew the rules. They had read the handbook. One had gone to leadership training. Both agreed that fighting (behavior that can be either a minor or very serious violation) could get you sent back to the institution. The resident who had been to leadership training said that too many write-ups had gotten one JRA youth sent back. One cited horseplay as a lesser infraction, the other mentioned not cleaning one’s room. Neither one had had an infraction. Neither one knew about the Youth Complaint procedure, perhaps because they thought I was referring to a Job Corps procedure instead of a JRA procedure.

Staff say that youth are returned to JRA because they present problems in the dorm or are not doing well in school or vocational training.

A review of the incident log revealed only two incident reports for JRA youth since the end of May. (Incident reports are entered into a logbook and are in chronological order. The current

book began at the end of May.) Some horseplay on the bus resulted in a 60-day restriction. There was an incident in which one resident was trying to get more points illegally.

ESCAPE PROCEDURES

Escape is defined as being absent from where the youth should be. An absence is considered an escape immediately. Staff may look for the youth. The administrator and JRA liaison described several escapes; all but one was off site. They noted that walking away from the facility involves crossing the Yakima Nation's lands, in itself a tribal offense, or walking down a public road.

VISITING

Visitation is after 4:00 p.m. on weekdays and variable on weekends. Visitors are family members. The JRA coordinator in Yakima approves even family members. Visits are always supervised and in the public areas. Intoxicated parents were said to be a big problem.

JRA MONITORING

The JRA liaison works closely with the JRA coordinator who is based in the Yakima regional office. Once a week he takes the JRA youth to a drug/alcohol meeting in Yakima. At that time he meets with the JRA coordinator. The coordinator may also meet with the youth. The coordinator also is on-site regularly—perhaps one half day a week. He checks the JRA liaison's logbook and visits dorms and program areas. He has been on campus in the evenings. The JRA liaison did not know of a formal performance review by JRA. Residents do a quarterly performance review of the facility.

RELATIONS WITH THE COMMUNITY

Fort Simcoe Job Corps has an advisory board. They believe in being active neighborhood members. Staff and youth participate in community activities in both White Swan and Toppenish.

All education and employment is on-site and provided by the Job Corps.

Law enforcement was not contacted about Fort Simcoe.

There are no neighbors within several miles.

GRIFFIN HOME RENTON, WASHINGTON

FACILITY AND NEIGHBORHOOD DESCRIPTION

Griffin Home is a 24-bed residential treatment facility for adolescent boys operated by Friends of Youth of Redmond Washington. The facility is accredited by the Council of Accreditation of Services for Families and Children. There are two programs at Griffin Home: Matsen House, a 12-bed program for sexually aggressive youth; and McEachern House, a 12-bed program for chemical dependency treatment and recovery. The chemical dependency program is a DASA licensed outpatient treatment program. The Matsen program serves both DCFS and JRA youth. JRA contracts for up to three beds in Matsen House. The McEachern House program serves only JRA youth. According to the program manager, McEachern House has generally run at about 80 percent capacity in recent months, but this can fluctuate considerably. There are reportedly few vacancies in the Matsen House program.

The facility has separate buildings for each program. Central facilities, including on-site administrative offices, kitchen, and dining room, are in the McEachern House. In addition to the residential and program buildings, there are a few other small buildings on the site. These living and program units were constructed in the 1970s, replacing an old mansion that had housed residential programs for youth since 1954. The site is quite large and buffered from its neighbors by terrain and vegetation.

The facility is located on Lake Washington Boulevard overlooking Gene Coulan Park and Lake Washington. There are few houses in the immediate vicinity, but single family residences, apartments and condominiums are nearby.

FACILITY SECURITY

Griffin Home has little in the way of physical security. There are no door or window alarms or security screens on bedroom windows. The site is lit on all sides of the building.

According to the program manager, Friends of Youth is considering adding alarms on doors and windows. JRA has been encouraging Griffin Home to install door and window alarms since the fall of 1997.

STAFFING

During the day shift, Griffin Home has a minimum of four staff on duty who have direct supervision responsibility of JRA and other youth. On weekends, this is increased to five. On Wednesdays there are seven daytime staff. In the evening there are at least six staff on duty. At night there are a three. On weekdays an additional three staff on usually on duty who do not have direct youth supervision responsibilities. While this is a higher staff to resident ratio than at most community residential facilities, the fact that the program is located in two different buildings increases the number of staff required for adequate supervision.

There were 19 full-time staff identified by Griffin Home in its self-assessment, all but two of whom have college degrees. According to the self-assessment, the average employee has worked just over three years at Griffin Home and a little under four years with juvenile offenders.

COMMUNITY RISK ASSESSMENT

Community risk assessments are conducted on JRA youth every 90 days. The assessments take place in staff meetings on Wednesdays. Typically, the case manager goes through the risk assessment form and solicits input from everyone present. If questions arise, the definitions may be read. According to the CRP Coordinator (who attends all staff meetings), this usually resolves any ambiguity and the risk assessment is completed.

The CRP Coordinator files the original copy of the risk assessment in the youth's legal file at the regional office. A copy of the risk assessment is filed in the youth's on-site case file.

Case files were not reviewed at Griffin Home during the site visit. According to verbal report of the CRA Coordinator, Griffin Home records are generally in good order.

VIOLATIONS AND INFRACTIONS

Griffin Home has an incident reporting system to record and report serious events. While violation of rules and other matters considered infractions can result in filing of an incident report, incidents include other matters not related to unacceptable behavior (e.g., injury to resident). The incident report form used by Griffin Home was one of the clearest and most useful incident report formats we saw this summer.

Incident reports are kept in a master file organized by year. Originals are filed in appropriate case files. There were a reported 71 incident reports written in FY 97. Griffin Home does an analysis of these incident reports on a quarterly basis as part of their accreditation quality assurance program.

According to survey data collected by the Washington State Institute for Public Policy, 37 JRA youth were admitted to Griffin Home in FY 97. Of these, 16 were returned to a JRA institution. Twelve of these returns were for criminal behavior. (Five of the twelve criminal behaviors were escapes.) This is an above average return rate for community residential facilities.

Griffin Home uses a level system to encourage good behavior and discourage unacceptable behavior.

ESCAPE PROCEDURES

Griffin Home defines escape as unaccounted for time in excess of 30 minutes or any obvious plan to leave (e.g., packed bags). In an interview with the program manager, it was stated that the program follows JRA bulletin #8 regarding definitions of unauthorized leaves. Escape procedures call for notification of Griffin management, JRA, police, and the youth's family.

According to JRA data, there were five escapes from Griffin Home in FY 97. JRA records show no escapes from Griffin Home in FY 98.

VISITING

Visiting for residents in McEachern House takes place on Saturday and Sunday afternoons. Matsen House residents may have visitors on Sunday afternoons. The number and type of visitors a resident may have depends on his level system status. At the higher levels, this can include friends and girlfriends as well as immediate family. Visitors must make an appointment

to visit at least 24 hours in advance. Visitors are screened by staff and cleared through the youth's family therapist.

Visits take place in the public areas of both buildings. Visitors are not allowed in residents' rooms. Visits are usually, but not always, under direct staff supervision.

JRA MONITORING

According to Griffin Home, JRA conducts a formal review of their program every two years. If true, this is a lower frequency of review than reported by other programs.

The last formal review reported by the program and examined by the consultant team was dated November 17, 1997. This review was exceptionally detailed. There were several deficiencies reported at that time which have special relevance to this study. In particular, it was noted that on-site spot accountability checks in the community were infrequent and that telephone checks were not always well verified or recorded.

According to the program manager, the CRP Coordinator is at Griffin Home about eight to ten hours per week. Some of these visits are in the evening. None have been at night or on weekends. The CRP Coordinator estimates that he is typically on-site two or three times a week. He attends all staffing meetings, which take place every Wednesday. On these days he is at the facility for about six hours. On other days he is there for two to three hours.

RELATIONS WITH THE COMMUNITY

Griffin Home has a community advisory committee which meets on a regular basis. This group includes the Police Chief of the Renton Police Department, the Director of Special Education in the Renton School District, a member of the City Council, and private citizens. The group does not screen youth for placement or involve itself in daily operating decisions. One committee member (a firefighter) was at the facility on the day of the site visit. He was very clear that as a committee member he did not want such authority or believe that the committee had the expertise to make such decisions. A second member of the advisory committee contacted by telephone voiced similar concerns.

Griffin Home works together with the Renton Fire Department on community service projects. On the day of the site visit, a group of firefighters from one of the fire stations visited and presented T-shirts and certificates to boys who had successfully completed a lengthy running program.

Schools

Some residents at Griffin Home attend public schools in Renton; others attend an on-site school with classes taught by teachers from the school district. A committee, which includes a representative from the school district, the police department, and Griffin Home, reviews youths for enrollment in the school. If the youth is believed to be too high-risk for regular school, he attends classes in the on-site school.

The school district member of the Griffin Home Advisory Committee spoke very highly of the program and of Griffin Home staff. She noted that she knows of other group homes and that "this one is very good." In her words, "I sing the praises of Griffin Home."

Justice System Representatives

The Renton Chief of Police is a member of the Griffin Home Advisory Committee. He said that the director of the Griffin Home is open about “both successes and failures.” He reported that the police department rarely is called upon to respond to incidents at the facility and says that it has little impact on the police, neighborhood, or community. He noted that an officer in the police department participates in reviews of which Griffin Home youths may attend regular public schools in Renton.

The King County Juvenile Court and Juvenile Probation do not have anything to do with juvenile offenders placed by JRA at Griffin Home.

Employers

Griffin Home residents mainly work at fast food operations in Renton. The manager at a McDonald’s said that the current Griffin Home resident working for him “is one of my best workers.” He said that Griffin Home staff check on their residents working at his store “regularly.” He would recommend hiring Griffin Home residents to other employers.

Neighbors

Griffin Home is relatively isolated from residential neighbors by a nearby wooded area and terrain. This isolation may decrease in the future if a large, undeveloped parcel adjacent to the property is developed as planned.

A nearby resident who lives on the other side of the parcel that is proposed for development said that Griffin Home is a quiet facility that has been a good neighbor. However, she said that members of the neighborhood block watch have raised questions and concerns about the program. In particular, they are worried that the facility has young sex offenders. There actually appears to be little knowledge of the facility by the neighbors. Someone on the block watch committee has reportedly obtained the name of the Griffin Home director but has not made an attempt to make actual contact.

BEST PRACTICES

Community Advisory Committee

Griffin Home’s community advisory committee is made up of stakeholders and citizens: the Chief of Police, a member of the City Council, a School District official, a neighborhood representative, people from the business community, etc. It brings together a number of people who have an interest in the program and the quality of life in their community. From the program’s perspective, the citizen’s advisory council has increased understanding of the program and helped bolster community support. From the committee members perspective, it provides them with information and insight into a service about with the community has interest and concern.

Outcome Measures

Griffin Home keeps track of data on current performance and on residents after they leave the program. This information is used for internal quality control and for checking the effectiveness of their programs.

Every month the program manager receives reports from key staff outlining issues having to do with JRA requirements, accreditation issues, and licensing requirements. Data are collected and reported on UAs, incident reports, searches, accountability checks, etc. This focuses the entire program on issues of importance and gives managers information on trends or areas requiring special attention.

In addition, residents sign an agreement when they enter the program saying they will participate in a follow-up review after they leave. Six months after leaving the program, an assessment is made of the youth's success or failure in the community. Phone calls are made to the youth, his family, and (where indicated) to collateral contacts such as probation officers. Among other things, the program tracks re-arrest and substance abuse relapse.

OTHER ISSUES

The program for sexually aggressive youth at Griffin Home formerly took six JRA youth and six DCFS youth. It now takes a maximum of three JRA youth, and Friends of Youth is considering abandoning services for sexually aggressive JRA youth altogether. According to the program manager, mandatory notification of neighbors about adjudicated sex offenders has generated too much controversy. There are no such notification requirements for DCFS youth (since they are not adjudicated), and it is believed that the program can keep full serving only DCFS clients.

Friends of Youth may also cease providing services to juvenile offenders in the substance abuse treatment program if the proposed community placement oversight committees are given what the program believes to be intrusive control over treatment decisions. Such a decision would end a nearly 50-year tradition of providing residential services to juvenile offenders by Griffin Home.

JESSIE DYSLIN'S BOYS RANCH TACOMA, WASHINGTON

FACILITY AND NEIGHBORHOOD DESCRIPTION

Jessie Dyslin's Boys Ranch is a former working ranch that has been converted into a residential substance abuse treatment center for adolescent boys. The program is licensed for up to 26 youth. The facility is named after the original donor and has been in continuous operation by Gateways for Youth for more than 75 years. The facility has one main building with eight large bedrooms that can accommodate up to three occupants each. JRA contracts for up to 20 beds. There were 16 JRA youth in residence on the day of the site visit. A second residential building with capacity for eight residents was vacant at the time of the site visit. This second building was not toured.

Gateways is Washington's largest private provider of community residential beds for JRA. Until recently, Gateways operated three facilities for JRA: the Puget Sound Center, Dyslin's Boys Ranch, and Forest Ridge Lodge. Because of decreased referrals from JRA, Forest Ridge Lodge (which had taken up to 26 JRA youth) and the eight-bed unit at Dyslin's Boys Ranch were closed. Puget Sound Center and the main facility at Dyslin's Boys Ranch remain open. Gateways plans to re-open the eight-bed facility at Dyslin's as a facility for DCFS referrals. The lease on the Forest Ridge Lodge was not renewed. Even with the loss of these beds, Gateway remains JRA's largest private provider of community residential beds.

It was reported that, when Forest Ridge Lodge and the smaller unit at Dyslin's were closed, Gateway's board of directors considered closing all of its JRA facilities and going out of the residential care business. The manner in which new JRA regulations are implemented may affect future board decisions. It was noted that the downturn in referrals and the absence of forecasts by JRA has made it very difficult for providers to plan for the future.

While the mailing address for Dyslin's Boys Ranch is Tacoma, it is actually located outside the city limits in a semi-rural area near Midland, about halfway between Tacoma and Puyallup. The ranch has about 35 acres and some nearby parcels are as large or larger. While there are several neighbors across the street, there are only a handful of residences in the vicinity. The nearest bus line is a mile away. Much of the land in the area is marshy and does not perk well. A proposal to expand the program several years ago was abandoned when a cost-effective solution to wastewater disposal could not be found.

FACILITY SECURITY

The facility has alarms on exterior doors, exterior lighting activated by motion detectors on all sides of the building, and screens on bedroom windows. It was reported that the program has had problems with the exterior lighting system. For one thing, since the building is quite low, it is possible for someone to reach up and unscrew the light bulb and thereby disable the zone. Window screens are also a problem. Screens were in various states of disrepair. It was reported that some residents periodically damage screens in an effort to better hide surreptitious smoking of cigarettes. Staff did not represent that the screens served any security purpose.

The facility has an excellent interior layout of public spaces (entry, visiting, passive and active recreation) that are easily viewed by staff in the duty office.

Staff have always tended to transport youth to and from off-site activities more at Dyslin's than at other Gateways facilities because of the relatively remote location of the ranch and the distance to bus lines.

STAFFING

During the week there are up to seven staff on duty on the day shift. This includes administrative staff, case workers, child care workers, and a cook. Four staff are on duty on weekends during the day shift. This includes case workers, child care workers, and a cook. Five staff are on duty on the evening shift, seven days a week. All evening duty staff are case workers or child care workers. There are two staff on duty at night.

It was reported that this level of staffing is higher than normally would be the case and was in anticipation of increasing the resident population. The Director of Residential Services for Gateways for Youth and Families noted that, "One of our major complaints with JRA is not knowing what the population will be from month to month, causing us to ride something of a roller coaster of hiring lots of staff, then laying them off or shifting their schedules around because residents did not arrive as planned."¹

COMMUNITY RISK ASSESSMENT

Community Risk Assessments are conducted on JRA youth every 90 days by a team led by the CRP Coordinator. The team includes the CRP Coordinator, the case manager, program director, and the youth. The inclusion of the youth in the assessment process is new at Dyslin's. Prior to this change, the assessment issues were reviewed at staff meetings, and the completed assessment form was later reviewed with the youth.

It was reported that case managers talk with school teachers and employers at least twice a month. Schools will also contact the program directly if there is a problem with a JRA student.

Two case files were examined to review Community Risk Assessments. One file contained the youth's Initial Security Classification Assessment and CRAs prior to coming to community placement but no CRAs after arrival at Dyslin's. Based on the most recent CRA found for this youth, he should have had two risk assessments since coming to Dyslin's. The second file contained no risk assessments, either before or after arrival at Dyslin's. However, a reference to a risk assessment data 4/28/98 was found in a monthly progress report for this youth. While the risk assessment form was not filed in the case file, the assessments for this youth appear to be up to date.

The location of community risk assessment forms was discussed with the CRP Coordinator for Dyslin's. She stated that the original risk assessment form is kept by JRA and that a copy is given to the case manager. The program is responsible for placing the CRA form in the on-site case file.

VIOLATIONS AND INFRACTIONS

Dyslin's uses incident reports to keep track of notable events related to the facility or program. Incident reports are kept in individual case files and in a master file folder. Dyslin's did not report the number of incident reports written in FY 97 in its self-assessment for this study.

¹ Correspondence from Barbara Gorzinski dated September 22, 1998.

The master file of incident reports was in poor order. The file was not bound and reports were filed non-sequentially. Some reports were duplicated. Incident reports involving juveniles were intermixed with incident reports involving staff and with Youth Complaint Forms. While the file may or may not be complete, its obvious lack of order did not inspire confidence.

With this caveat, incident reports in the master file were reviewed for the first six months of calendar year 1997. An attempt was made to categorize incidents by type. The results of this analysis are as follows:

INCIDENT REPORTS FOR THE FIRST SIX MONTHS OF 1997

Type of Incident	Number
Escape	1
Assault (with injury)	1
Fighting	4
Refusal to take UA	1
Attempt to smuggle in girlfriend	1
Theft	1
Contraband	2
Unaccounted for time	2
Threaten/verbal abuse of staff	4
Verbal abuse of resident	2
Property damage - unknown perpetrator	4
Subtotal - six months	23
Non-infraction	11
Staff alleged dereliction of duty by other staff	2
Total	36

Non-infractions included accidents, illness, a lost key, a small fire, and two occasions when an unknown vehicle came onto the property. While there may be other locations where this is true, Dyslin's is the only program examined where incident reports were seen where staff alleged violations of duty by other staff.

If these data are complete and representative of a typical six month period, there would be approximately 40 infractions per year at Dyslin's that can be attributed to an individual resident and perhaps 50 overall. According to the WSIPP survey, there were 28 youth returned to JRA from Dyslin's during FY 97.

One resident was interviewed at Dyslin's. He had only recently arrived but had been through orientation. He was positive about the program and clearly understood the rules and expectations at Dyslin's. He was familiar with the Youth Complaint Form.

ESCAPE PROCEDURES

Escape procedures for Dyslin's are defined by Gateways policy. The length of time that must pass before an unaccounted absence becomes an escape depends on the circumstances. However, it was reported that escape procedures are initiated as soon as it becomes known that a resident is unaccounted for, although checks are usually first made to determine that the absence is not just a communication problem. If the resident shows up late because of a bus change or other explainable reason, escape procedures can be cancelled.

The escape reporting procedure calls for staff to notify the police, program director, JRA Officer of the Day or CRP Coordinator, and the youth's parents or guardian. Victim notification is made through the Victim/Witness Program at Maple Lane School. Oakridge Group Home is notified to initiate the arrest warrant process.

The Gateways escape policy also includes a list of "causes" of escape that staff are to monitor to help prevent escapes. These include such things as crisis situations for the youth, withdrawal, retaliation against the program or outsiders, and peer rejection.

According to JRA data, there were 12 escapes from Dyslin's Boys Ranch in FY 97. There were two escapes during the first ten months of FY 98.

VISITING

Visiting takes place on Saturday and Sunday afternoons in the public areas of the building and grounds. The number and type of visitors a resident may have depends on the resident's level. Visitors are limited to parents, family, and approved visitors. It was reported that non-family visitors are screened through DSHS.

Visitors are always under direct staff supervision. As noted above, the design of the facility lends itself to good staff supervision of public areas.

JRA MONITORING

Formal reviews of Dyslin's Boys Ranch are conducted by JRA annually. The most recent review was completed in June 1998. Only minor issues were identified in the June 1998 review. Formal reviews are always announced and never take place on weekends or after normal business hours.

The current CRP Coordinator for Dyslin's Boys Ranch lives nearby. It was reported that she sometimes drops by in the evenings and on weekends, often with her children. These informal visits are in addition to the approximately 20 hours the CRP Coordinator spends at the facility each week. Dyslin's is one of the few CRP sites in the state where it was reported that the CRP Coordinator sometimes visits outside normal business hours.

RELATIONS WITH THE COMMUNITY

Schools

High school students at Dyslin's attend either Franklin Pierce High School or Gates (alternative) High School.

The vice principal at Franklin Pierce High School was extremely complimentary of Dyslin's staff. He said they were "wonderful" to work with and that they are "courteous, punctual, and supportive." Later on, he called them "exceptionally cooperative." He said most of the Dyslin's students are "very good." He said that if there is a problem, staff "are here in 10 minutes." In contrast, he noted that "some of our parents take days to respond." He was also complimentary of the supervision that Dyslin's student get from the group home. He volunteered that "I'd like to send some of our regular kids there."

Administrative staff at the alternative school were similarly positive. They, too, said that Dyslin's staff were "wonderful" to work with. They said that Dyslin's staff check on their residents by

phone “all the time” and do on-site checks once a week. One administrator, who has worked there for six years, said “we have problems with them [the Dyslin’s students] just like with other kids,” but Dyslin’s staff are “right there if there’s a problem.”

Employers

The manager at Frugal’s Restaurant hired his first Dyslin’s worker in February 1998 and hired a second one as soon as the first one left. He does not currently have a Dyslin’s worker. He said that both kids were “great” and that they continued to work for him until their release dates. He said that he will hire more Dyslin’s residents in the future. He said that Dyslin’s staff checked on both kids “all the time.”

The manager at a local McDonald’s has had one Dyslin’s resident working for him for the last seven or eight months. He said it’s “working out fine” and that he would recommend group home residents to other employers. He said that checks on his Dyslin’s worker are “sometimes” an inconvenience from a business standpoint.

Law Enforcement

By the time this report was written, repeated requests for information about Dyslin’s Boys Ranch to the Pierce County Sheriff’s office were still unanswered.

Neighbors

Surveys were sent out to the 12 addresses nearest to Dyslin’s Boys Ranch. Only two were returned. One respondent rated the group home a “good neighbor.” The other rated it an “average neighbor.” The first respondent noted that the group home provides litter control along 104th street and said “They are very contained. We seldom see any of the young people.” The other respondent was not as positive. This person thought that, at times, the facility had too many residents and that “they seldom do any work.”

While it’s difficult to attribute meaning to failure to respond, this very low response rate probably means that the facility has little impact on the neighborhood one way or another.

MORNING STAR BOYS RANCH SPOKANE, WASHINGTON

FACILITY AND NEIGHBORHOOD DESCRIPTION

Morning Star Boys Ranch is a 19-bed complex designed to help boys become successful adults. They have a particular interest in family reunification. They had three JRA boys on the day of the visit and a contract for four. Morning Star took delinquent youth until the 1970s and began to do so again four years ago. The other boys have behavioral and emotional problems or no families. Over half are private referrals.

Father Joe, the facility administrator, started Morning Star in the 1950s when he began housing boys in a small house located elsewhere on the 250-acre property. This shoestring operation has been succeeded by a well-endowed and well-staffed organization. The house was replaced in the 1970s with two very nice, well-maintained buildings. One contains the housing, kitchen, dining, living, and laundry areas as well as some administrative offices. The other has activity space including a gym, exercise room, a pottery, a dark room, and a room filled with cross-country skis, dirt bikes, and other outdoors sports equipment. A two-room school is several miles away in what was previously the elementary school for the area. About half the residents attend this school. The others go to regular public school. The Morning Star school is operated by the local school district with staff added by Morning Star. The school building also has some Morning Star administrative offices.

The building in which youth are housed is brick and steel construction. Nineteen large sleeping rooms (all but one quite sufficient for two but each housing only one resident) are arranged along a three-tiered corridor. On the top tier are six rooms for residents. On the middle tier are four residential rooms. At the end of middle tier is a cluster of four larger rooms, two of which are now used for youth who have reached the top level. On the bottom tier are seven rooms for residents. At one end of the corridor, and on the lowest level, is a large recreation room in which the pool table appears small in comparison. At the other end of the corridor are the dining room and kitchen, then offices and a large living room.

When Morning Star Boys Ranch was started, it was isolated. The neighbors were farmers and the neighbor-gathering place was, and still is, the grange hall. Today suburbia is rapidly approaching. The new houses are expensive, and many are on several-acre plots.

FACILITY SECURITY

None of the facilities are secure or alarmed. The agency depends entirely on staff security. One wall of each sleeping room is filled with very large sliding metal frame windows that open. In the case of the lower tier, they open onto ground level. Exterior doors open with a push bar. There are no cameras or even unusual outside lights. A fence keeps the horses in or serves only a decorative purpose.

The staff see many of these boys as deprived. Their intent is to provide them with an enriched environment, one that will build their self-esteem. With that as their goal, the appearance and much of the program suggest an expensive boarding school. The same may be said for security.

STAFFING

Administrative staff carefully counted the various kinds of staff, full- and part-time, to determine how many were on duty at any one time. Most day shifts have 7.5 staff. On weekends, this number drops to 2.5 to 3. They get the youth up, cover the school activities on-site and do school and job coordination. This group also includes the administrative staff who can be a jack-of-all-trades. The day of the site visit the secretary took a youth for an emergency doctor's visit.

Evening shift has between 5.5 and 3 staff, including on weekends. In the period after school and work, care staff spend a lot of time playing with the boys. Each is responsible for a group of as many as six. One staff person may propose a bike ride. If only part of his or her group want to go, and some from another group want to go as well, then the remainder stays with another staff person and does something else. Part of this time is spent supervising homework or chores. The activities have the feel of what you might expect a family to do.

Night shift has 1.4 to 2 staff. They have recently added to their graveyard shift to ensure that they have someone awake and in the living area at all times. Previously the "night man" was the only one on duty, and he also did the laundry in the basement. He was basically there in case of an emergency. That person still does the laundry, but now in the dining room, which is much closer to the sleeping area.

Youths who are in school off-site are in the middle and high schools of the district. A Morning Star staff person is the school coordinator. She spends her day at the two schools, checking on students in their classrooms, talking to school staff, teachers, and residents. She has developed good working relationships with school security.

Boys who are at work are also monitored, but not as closely. With both schools and employers, Morning Star asks that a contract be signed by school or job staff and by the youth. This contract requires that staff call immediately if the youth cannot be found, arrives late or leaves earlier without prior verified approval, acts suspicious, or presents problematic behavior.

Residents are also sometimes off-site in groups. Part of the program entails the same kind of vacation activities these youth might experience in their families. For example, all staff and residents were scheduled to go camping in Idaho for a week. Some of them went river rafting in Oregon earlier in the summer. JRA did not approve of their kids going, so some staff and the JRA boys stayed home. They participate as a group in neighborhood picnics at a nearby park.

COMMUNITY RISK ASSESSMENT

Risk assessments are organized in a single notebook. The face sheet lists every youth and when the next risk assessment is due. It was not surprising to find all risk assessment done in a timely fashion.

VIOLATIONS AND INFRACTIONS

This facility has a level system coordinated by group leaders. Level changes, as well as the boys' progress, are discussed in biweekly treatment team meetings. The treatment team consists of group leaders, supervisors, social workers, and the school liaison. Level changes are not final until the facility administrator approves.

Level requirements are specific to work, school, growth, family, rooms, and attitude/behavior. Residents accumulate points and receive a daily report. The report comments on problems and successes. Privileges are clear at each level. Most relate to activities, such as walks, and independence. Residents can progress and regress through the levels. They point out that JRA's new restrictions work poorly with the level system since you cannot give the JRA youths the privileges associated with higher levels if those include opportunities prohibited by JRA.

On the day of the site visit there was only one JRA youth on-site. He was fairly new and was attending school. Another JRA youth was working, and one was at high school football practice. Despite his newness, this youth did know what got you into trouble and that the consequences ranged from losing activities to going back to a JRA institution.

The incident log is kept in a separate notebook. There is a sheet for each incident listing the type of incident and the response. It is not specific to JRA youth. With some assistance from staff in identifying JRA youth, I reviewed five records. One had a positive UA. He lost a level and his home pass. Another escaped and was returned to JRA. A third was intimidating another youth and was placed on temporary room restriction. A fourth was another escape; he, too, was returned to JRA. The fifth youth was antagonizing some other boys and was placed on temporary room restriction.

Much of the staff's emphasis seems to be on encouraging youths and thus on granting privileges for good behavior rather than withdrawing privileges for bad behavior. However, the rules state that levels may be reduced if the youth is not meeting expectations for that level or if the misconduct is severe enough to warrant a drop in level. Severe misconduct includes AWOL, violence, property damage, etc. Status as a JRA youth, of course, changes the consequences for severe misconduct.

ESCAPE PROCEDURES

Procedures require that when "a committed resident cannot be immediately located, staff are to search buildings and grounds to determine escapee status." If they cannot find the youth or if he has not returned within an hour of the expected time (timing is coordinated with the bus schedules), then staff calls the administrator on duty. The administrator faxes a warrant to Maple Lane, notifies law enforcement, notifies parents, reports the escape to either Canyon View or Sunrise Group Home, and contacts regional on-call staff. Staffers fill out the escape report. The full report is faxed to the regional administrator for JRA the next working day.

Three JRA youth have escaped in the last four years. Two escaped within the last year. Both escapes are instructive and tell something about the program's use of staff as security. In one case, the youth was at school. The high school is an open campus. Kids come and go, as do visitors. JRA youth cannot leave campus. During lunch this boy crossed the street, leaving the school grounds, and technically became an escapee. The school coordinator learned almost immediately that he was across the street sitting in a car with some other kids. She went over and took him back across the street to the security office. He put up no resistance. Then they discovered that his friends had dropped by in a stolen car. His stay at Morning Star was over, and he went back to JRA.

In the other case, the youth was at the residence. It was during the evening hours (6:55 p.m.) when youth are cleaning up after dinner and doing homework. The staff person responsible checked the youth's room. About 10 minutes later another boy saw two boys walking away. (One was a JRA resident, the other not.) The observer informed a staff person who looked out

the window and also saw the boys walking down the road. In another few minutes, the staff person would have discovered for himself that they were gone. Staff notified the administrator who came in and issued the warrant, notified JRA, etc. Father Joe went looking for the boys and picked them up down the road where they were waiting at the bus stop. The non-JRA boy planned to go to a party and invited the JRA boy to join him. The JRA boy went back to the institution. The other boy remained at the facility. This is the only one of the four JRA escapes where the youth went out the window.

VISITING

Visitation is in the late afternoons and early evenings during the week and mid-afternoons on weekends. All visits are arranged in advance with the resident's case manager. Visitors are also pre-approved by the resident's case manager. Generally, residents can see professional visitors, such as attorneys, probation officers, state caseworkers, and parents or guardians.

As the youth moves up to the top level, they may receive other visitors. Those visitors have to go through a Washington State Patrol check and have a face-to-face interview with staff outlining the guidelines for visitations.

JRA MONITORING

The CRP coordinator is at the facility about two hours a week, never in the evening or on weekends. It was reported that the CRP coordinator has responded in a timely fashion when problems arose and that he has acted the "heavy" when necessary. He has assisted in getting special privileges, such as permission for JRA youth to go on the scheduled camping trip to Idaho. He has been helpful in explaining JRA expectations as the new guidelines emerge.

JRA has never conducted an unannounced program review. The last performance review was in the summer of 1996. Staff have no knowledge of JRA contacting neighbors, schools, employers, or law enforcement.

RELATIONS WITH THE COMMUNITY

Morning Star Boys Ranch has a long history of interaction with its neighbors. It is part of the Glenrose Neighborhood Association. Staff and boys participate in community events, setting up for fairs at the grange, and assisting the neighborhood association with clean-up days. Neighbors drop in. Some of the elderly neighbors ask if the boys can help them. Members of their board of directors are local, including Senator Jim West.

Schools

School staff speak positively of Morning Star students and of their school liaison. The Ferris High School vice principal notes that Morning Star staff have their own transitional school and that they are very careful about the students they refer to Ferris. When asked about the agreement form, he stated that they sign one for each JRA student who enters. He says the relationship is very positive and that he wishes all students were as well supervised.

It was reported that the school liaison is around so often that she or he has a school ID badge. They check with the attendance office and talk to teachers. They report misbehaviors to the school. In one case involving a scuffle outside the school bus, they reported the two residents. The two were suspended from school and then from Morning Star.

Employers

Morning Star residents must be in an upper level to be employed. Few JRA commitment youth are there long enough to make it to an upper level. No employers of JRA youths were available for consultation.

Justice Agency Representatives

Morning Star is in unincorporated Spokane County. The lieutenant on patrol is an older officer who knows Morning Star well. He speaks positively of their program.

The Sheriff is not notified of a new JRA commitment resident at Morning Star. Because of the way the sex offender notification law is written, they would not be notified of a sex offender being placed there since this is an in-custody residence. They are notified of escapes, although not as quickly as law enforcement might want. The sheriff sees this as a difference in philosophy and not a big issue. They have answered calls for service from the facility which have ranged from assaults to smoking. They expect a lot of incidents from that type of facility and are not getting more than they would expect. They have had no calls from its neighbors.

The Juvenile Court Administrator for Spokane County states that the facility has little impact on the court, his probation services, or detention.

Neighbors

Written surveys were sent to five Morning Star neighbors. Three were returned. Every single person who returned a survey rated Morning Star as an "excellent neighbor." All were aware of positive contributions the program and residents had made to the community. Two respondents wrote glowing comments, including one that said, "they have rescued lots of boys." No other community residential facility in the state received as high marks from its neighbors as Morning Star.

OAKRIDGE COMMUNITY REINTEGRATION PROGRAM TACOMA, WASHINGTON

FACILITY AND NEIGHBORHOOD DESCRIPTION

Oakridge Community Reintegration Program is a state-run group home for up to 22 JRA boys. It is located at the eastern edge of the Western State Hospital campus. The facility was constructed in 1969 using the same plan as the Canyon View, Riverview, and Pioneer Group Homes. It has been in use as a JRA group home ever since. During this time, it has been a facility for girls, a co-ed facility, and (since 1980) a facility for boys.

The facility is a single story wood frame structure with 11 bedrooms, 10 of which are easily doubled. A smaller bedroom is sometimes used as a single- and sometimes as a double-occupancy room. There were 14 juveniles in residence on the day of the site visit. The facility also has a kitchen, multi-purpose dining room, recreation room, duty station, and cramped staff offices and workspace. Oakridge uses a room in a nearby building for an on-site classroom.

The facility is on a large site at the intersection of two busy streets: Steilacoom Boulevard and 87th Avenue, SW. The Child Study and Treatment Center and Western State Hospital are to the west. There are commercial establishments at the other corners of the intersection. To the north is a fire station. A large, relatively new apartment complex is across 87th to the east and north. Because of the size of the site, the scale of the building, and the amount of vegetation between it and the two busy streets, the facility is hardly noticeable to passersby.

FACILITY SECURITY

All exterior doors are locked to prevent entry from the outside and alarmed to indicate egress. The alarm has a delay so that the door remains locked for 15 seconds after an attempt to open it.

Windows in the sleeping rooms have heavy metal screens welded in place. When asked how emergency egress was accomplished, the program administrator said, "Chair through the window [that doesn't have a screen]." The fire marshal was reported to have approved this procedure. While the screens are designed to hinder passage of contraband, the one screen that was carefully examined during the tour had a small hole in it, probably for disposing contraband cigarette butts.

Video cameras are located at various of places throughout the facility. The cameras rotate through a cycle on a single monitor in the duty station where a video cassette recorder is in continuous operation. There are no outdoor cameras. The program administrator was enthusiastic about this security addition and reports that it costs about \$300 per camera.

The site is partly fenced and well illuminated at night.

STAFFING

The program operates with two staff on duty who have responsibility for supervising juveniles during the day shift Monday through Friday. There is one staff member on duty during the first part of the day shift on Saturday and two after 2:00 p.m. Sunday day shift staffing is one until 10:00, two from 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m., and three during the rest of the shift. Other employees without supervisory responsibility (cook, maintenance, clerical) are on duty during weekdays.

One non-supervisory employee is also on duty on weekend days. Between two and six staff are on duty in the evening (average = 3.7). Only one employee is on duty at night.

The average full-time employee at Oakridge has nearly 20 years experience working with juvenile offenders and more than 13 years experience working at Oakridge. The current administrator has been administrator at Oakridge ever since it opened in 1969. Even the facility's cook has been at Oakridge for 20 years.

There is little drop-off in experience when part-time staff are used. The average part-time employee has 13 years experience working with juvenile offenders and nearly five and a half years experience at Oakridge.

COMMUNITY RISK ASSESSMENT

Community risk assessments are done at staff meetings. They involve a variety of staff, including the Clover Park School District teacher assigned to the on-site school at Oakridge. A well-attended staff meeting was going on at the time of the site visit.

Case files for three residents were reviewed, and all of the community risk assessments for these residents were found to be on file and up to date.

Two risk assessments that were conducted at a JRA institution prior to transfer to Oakridge were noted to be clearly in error. Both risk assessments involved the same juvenile. In one case, the youth's crime seriousness score was missing. In the other, the youth's initial risk score was missing. I asked the facility administrator if there was a general problem with risk assessment accuracy coming from JRA institutions. He replied that he thought that risk assessments in the institutions were getting better.

Formal agreements between JRA and schools and employers have been used at Oakridge since the fall of 1997. It was reported that Pierce College could not provide the level of monitoring required by agreement and, as a result, Oakridge residents no longer go to this school.

On-site and telephone checks for youth at school or work are recorded in the daily log. It was reported that random checks are sometimes done by staff on the way to or from work.

The administrator stressed that the program has long-term relationships and excellent communication with many of the teachers and employers the program uses.

VIOLATIONS AND INFRACTIONS

Based on survey data collected by the WSIPP, 39 juveniles were admitted to Oakridge in FY 97. Of these, nearly half (18) were returned to a JRA institution. One other resident escaped and was not returned to JRA.

Incident reports are kept in individual case files. The program does not keep a central file of incident reports but made copies of incident reports for FY 97 for review by the consultant. There were exceptionally few incidents provided for review: 19 for the entire year. Given that there were 19 youth returned to a JRA institution or who escaped from Oakridge and were not

returned during FY 97, this does not seem plausible. Either incidents are not always recorded, or not all the incident reports were provided for the review.²

The program does not have a level system or published set of sanctions for specific types of behavior.

ESCAPE PROCEDURES

Oakridge defines escape as any circumstances when a resident cannot be accounted for. Based on JRA Bulletin #17, the unaccounted-for time may be considered an unauthorized leave if the resident returns within four hours. The administrator, JRA Officer of the Day, the Regional Administrator, JRA headquarters, state patrol, local law enforcement, and the juvenile's parents or guardians are all notified in the event of an escape.

According to JRA data, there were ten escapes from Oakridge Group Home in FY 97 and four in FY 98. In response to this finding, the Oakridge administrator responded that there were only six escapes from the institution in FY 97. Upon inquiry to JRA it was determined that the agency's electronic records are not always updated if an escape is reported and then cancelled when the youth voluntarily returns within the four-hour time limit that is used for the definition of "Unauthorized Leave II." In other words, JRA electronic data probably overstate the number of actual escapes from community residential facilities.

VISITING

Visiting takes place in the multi-purpose room, recreation room, or approved outdoor area on Saturday and Sunday afternoons. Visiting is permitted for family and approved friends. All visitors must show a valid I.D. and meet with the assigned counselor or designee.

As noted under "Staffing" (above), staffing levels are increased during visiting hours.

JRA MONITORING

Unlike privately-run community residential facilities, there is little monitoring of state-run group homes by JRA. It was reported that regional or headquarters staff review operations at Oakridge two to three times a year. However, the only written report concerning Oakridge that was examined by the consultant was dated December 1996 and was far less detailed than normal reviews of contract facilities in the same region.

RELATIONS WITH THE COMMUNITY

The Oakridge administrator reports that the program has tried to be involved with the community over the years. The administrator attends most local chamber of commerce meetings and is in contact with local legislators. Residents at Oakridge are involved in street and highway cleaning and other local service projects. In general, however, the community seems to pay little attention to the group home.

² In response to this comment, the facility administrator wrote in a letter dated September 16, 1998: "Incident reports were not written on all youth returning to an institution due to the situation not warranting an incident report. Due to the fact that we compiled the incidents for your visit, not all incidents were available from files already transferred out of Oakridge."

It was reported that there used to be an Oakbrook Crime Watch program which, among other things, provided volunteers, money, and gifts for residents at Oakridge. This program lasted about four years.

Schools

In conversation with the Clover Park principal, it was reported that, through the fall of 1997, Oakridge youth either attended the district's alternative school or the on-site school at the Child Study and Treatment Center next to Oakridge.³ A Clover Park teacher assigned to the on-site school provided (and continues to provide) visiting educational services to youth restricted to the Oakridge facility.

In late 1997, when JRA promulgated more restrictive policies regarding monitoring of youth at school, it was determined that Clover Park was unable to provide the level of supervision at the alternative school required by the Oakridge administrator. As a result, none of the youth at Oakridge currently attend Clover Park schools with regular high school students; all Oakridge youth now attend the on-site school at the Child Study and Treatment Center or have classes in the Oakridge facility itself.

The principal noted that this change was a JRA decision and that "we hadn't had any [significant] problems" with Oakridge students. She also said that the district would welcome Oakridge youth back into the alternative school if policies were made less restrictive or if someone else were responsible for constant supervision of JRA youth.

The same Clover Park School District teacher has provided educational services at the on-site school and the facility for many years and is considered an integral part of the Oakridge team. As a result, information about issues that occur at the school are more or less constantly shared with Oakridge staff.

Justice Agency Representatives

Law enforcement services in the Oakridge area are provided to the City of Lakewood under contract by the Pierce County Sheriff's Department. Repeated calls to the Pierce County Sheriff's department were not answered at the time this report was written.

The Pierce County Juvenile Court and Juvenile Probation do not have anything to do with juvenile offenders in Oakridge Group Home.

Employers

The manager at Personal Design Concepts, an organization that prepares wholesale gift items for businesses, reported that they had three Oakridge youth as employees in 1997 and one in 1998. Their experience with Oakridge youth was described as positive. The manager said that Oakridge youth were punctual, good workers who didn't cause any problems. She did, however, say that daily calls from the facility to check on the youths were an inconvenience. This is particularly true when the business gears up for high seasonal demand and can have as many as 400 employees working around the clock. Nonetheless, she would recommend hiring group home youth to other employers.

³ The on-site school at the Child Study and Treatment Center is the Firwood School. It was reported that JRA youth from Oakridge attend classes in a different part of the school locked off from CSTC clients. The two populations do not mix.

The manager at a Kentucky Fried Chicken store said that the current employee they have from Oakridge is “one of the best employees I’ve ever had.” This youth is her first experience with a group home resident and she said, “I don’t know what they do with them down there, but he just blew me away.” Among the positive attributes she described was “a willingness to learn.” She would definitely recommend Oakridge group home hires to other employers.

The manager of a new IHOP store was also enthusiastic. She has had two Oakridge residents working for her for five of the six months she has had the store. “They’re great kids,” she said. She also said, “They’re more reliable than people I hire off the street.” She said that the calls and site checks by Oakridge staff didn’t interfere with operations and were not a burden. She has already recommended Oakridge residents as hires to other IHOP stores.

Neighbors

Until fairly recently, the facility had very few residential neighbors. The facility is located on the grounds of the Western State Hospital complex. To the south, across Steilacoom Boulevard, is a large park. Immediately to the east, across 87th, is a shopping complex. There is a fire station to the north. Kitty-corner across Steilacoom Boulevard and 87th is a modest single family residence. There is a small, older apartment building to the east of that. Because the group home is set back from the street and both Steilacoom Boulevard and 87th are busy arterioles, there is a strong sense of separation between these few residences and the group home.

About eight years ago, a large apartment complex, called Brighton Place, was built to the north of the shopping center on the opposite side of 87th from the group home. This facility faces the driveway to the group home. The resident manager of the apartment complex was unaware that the facility was a group home and thought it was just part of Western State Hospital. He was aware that there were teenage boys there. He said that in the three years he has been manager there has never been a problem. He was unaware of any problems that might have occurred prior to that time.

BEST PRACTICES

Experience, Experience, Experience

The average amount of experience of Oakridge staff is truly amazing. The average full-time employee working at Oakridge has had nearly 20 years experience working with juvenile offenders and almost 13 years experience in working at this facility. There is little drop-off in experience when part-time staff are called in: they have an average of 13 years experience working with juvenile offenders. While it is certainly possible for a small organization to get stuck in its ways, this does not appear to be the case at Oakridge. The work climate seems positive. Staff appear to interact well with residents and with each other. It seems highly unlikely that anything could happen that a staff as experienced as this could not handle.

One former Oakridge employee, who is now a CRP Coordinator, called her experience at the group home “the perfect job.” She said the only reason she left was because she had to work too many weekends and non-standard hours and this conflicted with her family life.

OUR SISTER'S HOUSE TACOMA, WASHINGTON

FACILITY AND NEIGHBORHOOD DESCRIPTION

Our Sister's House (OSH) is an eight-bed community residential facility providing services for adolescent girls. The facility can take up to six JRA girls and two DCFS girls. The director said they have averaged three to four girls since the Fall of 1997, although there have been times when they have had as many as six or seven. Five girls were in residence at the time of the site visit (July 8, 1998). All girls in residence at the time of the site visit were JRA referrals.

The facility is a former five-bedroom, single-family residence located on a small corner lot at the intersection of two residential streets in the northern part of Tacoma. The neighborhood is made up of generally well-maintained, single-family residences and apartment buildings. Several houses directly across the street from Our Sister's House are large, immaculately kept, stately older homes. Other houses (including Our Sister's House) are more modest. According to the executive director of Our Sister's House, the neighborhood is part of an historic preservation district and is near the birthplace of Bing Crosby. Special restrictions and ordinances govern outside construction and remodeling in this neighborhood.

The interior consists of three upstairs bedrooms and a main floor with living room, dining room, kitchen, and offices. Two of the bedrooms have two beds, one has four. While the facility meets licensing standards for eight beds, the four-bed room and one of the two-bed rooms seem cramped.

In addition to small bedrooms, space is a problem throughout the facility. Office space is particularly tight. For example, the copy machine and bulletin board for recording key dates and information about current residents are located in a downstairs staff bathroom.

Our Sister's House is purchasing the building and has plans for a small addition to add support space. There are no plans to expand the overall capacity of the facility.

The program and service provider at Our Sister's House are both relatively new to the group home business and JRA. Our Sister's House began operation in January 1995. Prior to that time, the facility was a group home for developmentally disabled adults. Because the facility was already approved for group home occupancy, there were no public hearings or community notifications required regarding the change in status from one type of group home to another. I was told other group homes (for seniors and for developmentally disabled adults) are in the vicinity.

FACILITY SECURITY

The building is a two-story, wood frame residence. As such, occupants must be able to exit the building in case of fire by way of doors or emergency egress windows from bedrooms. In this context, "facility security" is limited to alarms that alert staff to when a door or window has been opened.

While Our Sister's House has door alarms on the two exit doors in the building, neither worked on the day it was visited by the consultant. The front door has a wrought-iron security grill whose purpose is more to keep people out than in.

All windows in Our Sister's House are double-hung casement type windows. There are two operable windows in each of the upstairs bedrooms. Some of the windows in the living room, dining room, and offices are also operable. There are no alarms on any windows.

While the property is fenced, the fence serves no security purpose except to keep people and stray animals away from the building.

STAFFING

Our Sister's House operates with two staff on duty during the day and evening shift and one awake staff at night. Staffing is the same every day of the week. Administrative staff, the JRA CRP Coordinator, and program staff from other organizations may be on-site during regular business hours Monday through Friday.

Residents are driven to and from work, school, or outside appointments. These transports, and periodic school and workplace visits, are provided by regular on duty staff.

COMMUNITY RISK ASSESSMENT

Community risk assessments are done by a committee made up of the program director, the case manager, and the JRA CRP Coordinator. It was stated that the case manager has lead responsibility for risk assessments for the program. (The CRP Coordinator has the overall lead responsibility for risk assessments.) The case manager on duty at the time of the site visit was a new employee. She had been there for only two months (and had worked with juveniles for only five months). So far, there have been no girls who required a risk assessment during the brief tenure of this new case manager.

Only one of the girls in residence at Our Sister's House had been there long enough to have needed a community risk assessment. Review of her case file indicated that the risk assessment had been done in a timely and accurate manner.

The issue of obtaining outside information about the behavior of individual girls away from the residence—from schools and employers—was discussed with the executive and program director. The program director said that initial interviews are conducted with schools and employers prior to placing a girl with them. Teachers and employers are contacted periodically to determine how the girl is doing. Because of the size of the program, information obtained from these contacts is clearly available to the risk assessment team.

VIOLATIONS AND INFRACTIONS

Rules, expectations, and consequences for rule violation are spelled out in the Resident's Manual. As with most other community residential placement facilities, Our Sister's House uses a level system for rewarding positive behavior and "consequencing" negative behavior. One consequence of rule violation may be reassignment to a lower or more restrictive level.

As with other community residential placement facilities, violations and infractions are not part of the normal vocabulary at Our Sister's House. Rule violations are treated as "incidents." An incident may be written up as a "Serious Incident Report" or as a less serious, in-house report. Serious incidents include issues that are not rule violations. For example, illness, accidents resulting in injury, and suicide ideation or attempts are all serious incidents. Serious Incident Reports are filed with JRA.

Our Sister's House reported ten serious incident reports during FY97. Since there is no master file of incident reports and all FY97 reports are filed in case files that are now closed and archived, no verification of this number, or identification of the specific types of incidents involved, was completed.⁴ According to WSIPP survey data, three girls were returned from Our Sister's House to a JRA institution during FY97.

Other than return to a JRA institution, the most serious consequence for unacceptable behavior is placement on "R" (restricted) level. While on R-level, residents may not leave the facility for any reason other than court-related issues. (Schools and treatment agencies are contacted for excused absences.) Phone calls and visits are permitted only at authorized times, and these are restricted to caseworkers, probation/parole officers, guardians ad litem, attorneys, and parents or guardians. Additional chores may be assigned.

The one girl who has been at Our Sister's House for more than a few weeks was interviewed. She was clearly aware of house rules, expectations and consequences, and believes that staff are generally fair in the enforcement of rules. She was aware of the JRA Youth Complaint process but stated that "nobody ever uses it." As she put it, "They just go to Delores" (i.e., the program director). This girl spoke highly of the community meeting process as a way to resolve issues within the facility.

It was noted by the Executive Director of Our Sister's House that appeals on issues raised through the Youth Complaint Process can be taken to her and, ultimately, to the Assistant Secretary of DSHS for JRA. The Executive Director stated that "this process has been utilized by JRA residents within the Our Sister's House facility and has obtained satisfactory results within the agency's structure."⁵

ESCAPE PROCEDURES

According to JRA data, no escapes were made from Our Sister's House during FY97. However, there were three escapes in FY98, one of which was attributed to staff error. The person responsible for permitting the escape was terminated by OSH and staff training in escape procedures was reinforced.

An escape is defined by Our Sister's House as any unauthorized absence in excess of 15 minutes. This can be an absence from Our Sister's House, school, work, community-based treatment, or failure to arrive at any of the foregoing within 15 minutes of scheduled arrival. Currently, all transportation to and from community placements is provided by Our Sister's House staff. Consequently, monitoring of arrival times is self-documenting.

Our Sister's House has an Escape Report form that lists who is to be contacted in the event of an escape. This includes law enforcement (911), Oakridge Group Home, the JRA Officer of the Day, the Our Sister's House Program Manager, the JRA CRP Coordinator, the Our Sister's House Case Manager, the Victim Notification Office, and the escapee's parents or guardians. The Escape Report form was posted on the wall in the staff office.

⁴ It was later reported that archived files are kept on site, so verification could have taken place by reviewing the files of all the residents who spent part of FY97 at Our Sister's House. (Correspondence from Sharon Manier, Executive Director of Our Sister's House, dated August 21, 1998.)

⁵ Correspondence from Sharon Manier, Executive Director of Our Sister's House, dated August 21, 1998.

Past failure to follow proper procedures, including procedures regarding escapes, was cited in a JRA review of Our Sister's House dated December 1997. See discussion under "JRA Monitoring" below.

VISITING

According to the Executive Director of Our Sister's House, all visiting at the facility takes place on the ground floor level. However, according to the Resident's Manual, female visitors may be shown a girl's room if accompanied by a staff escort. There are three interconnected rooms on the ground floor: a living room, dining room, and kitchen. The openings between these rooms are large and the spaces are arranged in such a way that one staff person can easily monitor activities throughout the public spaces on the ground floor. Monitoring, however, requires staff to be present. The staff office is enclosed and separate from the public spaces. Our Sister's House reports that visits are always under staff observation.

Visiting takes place on Saturday and Sunday afternoons and on weekdays with special permission. The number and type of visitors allowed depends on the girl's level assignment. Girls on Level I may have visits only from immediate family. Girls on Level II may have two friends visit; those on Level III may have additional friends visit. Each girl has a list of visitors approved by the case manager. It was reported that the case manager contacts prospective visitors by phone to verify information and then interviews the visitor at the time of the first visit.

JRA MONITORING

Formal reviews of Our Sister's House are scheduled to take place annually. The most recent of these occurred in June 1998. This, and previous reviews dated December 1997, were reviewed by the consultant. The reviews are clear and thorough. When deficiencies are noted, action plans and target compliance dates are listed. According to Our Sister's House, all reviews take place during normal business hours, Monday through Friday.

The December reviews included several relatively serious deficiencies. These included failure to follow proper procedures in a way that facilitated an escape; inconsistent documentation of sign-ins and sign-outs; failure to follow procedures for telephone use, visiting, and community passes; and apparent lack of strong knowledge of JRA bulletins, policies, and procedures by the program director. The staff person on duty at the time of the escape was terminated by Our Sister's House and correspondence indicates additional staff training about these matters took place. None of these issues were repeated in the June 1998 review.

In addition to formal reviews, the CRP Coordinator visits the site on a regular basis. Our Sister's House estimates that the CRP Coordinator is on-site about five hours per week. The CRP Coordinator estimates her involvement at 10 to 15 hours per week, including attendance at most Monday afternoon staff meetings. While most visits occur during normal business hours, staff meetings often last until 6 p.m. It was reported that the CRP Coordinator also has worked at the facility in the evening to assist with crisis situations. The current CRP Coordinator has been in this position since December 1996.

RELATIONS WITH THE COMMUNITY

Our Sister's House has an advisory board that includes community members. This board is primarily a fund-raising board and has no oversight over placement decisions. It was reported

by the program staff that the relationship of Our Sister's House to nearby residents was casual and neighborly. At least one nearby resident has made donations to Our Sister's House.

Schools

Only one school, the Region 5 Learning Center in Tacoma, was listed as a school attended by Our Sister's House residents. The administrator at Region 5 Learning Center noted that Our Sister's House provides transportation for its girls to and from the center. She said that staff were very responsive to the occasional problems they have with Our Sister's House girls at the school and that consistent site checks were made both by phone and in person.

Employers

Of the two employers listed for Our Sister's House, neither currently has any employees from the facility. One fast food restaurant had a new manager who knew nothing of the business' past experience with girls from Our Sister's House.

The manager at a second fast food restaurant said that their experience had not worked well. She characterized the girls from Our Sister's House as good workers but that in each case a girl would "mess up at the house" and be restricted or be "taken away." These restrictions interfered with work schedules. She said that the business needs more dependable workers, and they do not intend to hire any more girls from Our Sister's House.

Law Enforcement

The community liaison officer from the Tacoma Police Department who is responsible for the area in which Our Sister's House is located said that there have been no neighborhood complaints about the facility. He reported that staff have always been "great" to work with. He said the most common problem at the facility is runaways.

The Juvenile Court and Juvenile Probation have no relationship with Our Sister's House.

Neighbors

A survey was mailed to the nine nearest addresses. A total of four responses were received. On a five-point scale ranging from excellent to very poor, two of the respondents rated Our Sister's House as a "good neighbor," one rated it as an "average neighbor," and one rated it as an "extremely poor neighbor." One of the respondents who rated the facility as a good neighbor reported that it is sometimes loud when a group of girls is on the front porch and that occasionally cars pull up in the early morning and honk to get the attention of someone in the group home. This same respondent noted that there have been a "handful of calls in which police responded." The person who rated the facility as an average neighbor said there had been one recent instance of loud music.

The person who rated the facility as a "very poor neighbor" had many complaints. This included poor maintenance of the facility, loud music, creation of parking problems in the neighborhood, and "rude people" who are "defensive and standoffish in their manner." This person also stated that "police are always picking up folks." While this respondent stated that "every neighbor has similar complaints," all the other respondents stated that the facility was maintained up to neighborhood standards and that it did not create parking problems. Three respondents answered yes to the question, "Do you, or would you, feel comfortable talking with group home

management or staff about a problem you wanted resolved?” Noise was cited as an issue by three of the four respondents.

PARKE CREEK GROUP HOME ELLENSBURG, WASHINGTON

FACILITY AND NEIGHBORHOOD DESCRIPTION

The Parke Creek facility is a 16-bed facility constructed in 1981, originally as church-sponsored home for girls. It was used only briefly for that purpose. Parke Creek became a DASA certified 30-day residential drug/alcohol treatment facility in 1988. It now takes only boys.

In the few months preceding the site visit, Parke Creek was having trouble keeping their numbers up. As a result, they accepted parole violators. They reported that all the community residential facilities and Group Homes are competing for residents.

The facility has two one-story, wood frame buildings. One combines residential and office space. The residential area consists of seven double rooms and one that can be triple bunked. There is a large dining room with adjoining kitchen and a living room space. The building has a small enclosed and windowed staff room (called the "kiosk") that looks at all the residential areas. The office space has a treatment room used for group sessions and four office areas. The second and smaller building is used for the school and family groups.

The neighborhood is rural with houses distributed across rural-sized lots and larger pre-existing farms. The nearest neighbor is approximately a quarter of a mile down the road.

FACILITY SECURITY

The windows that open have security screens. The main building has four exterior doors: the front door, the door from the living room to the patio, the door out the back and to the basketball court and the school, and the door exiting off the end of the sleeping corridor. Exterior doors, except for the front door, have push bar releases in case of fire. All have audible alarms. Two of the doors in the residential area are used frequently during programming hours and the alarm system is deactivated at such times.

The school building has two doors on the side of the main building, one to the classroom and the other to the family group room. Each room also has a side exit away from the main building. All doors have push-bar releases in case of fire and no audible alarms. All are locked when program staff are not there. Windows in this area open.

There are no fences except a low split rail fence in front. The building and grounds are lit at night.

STAFFING

From 8 a.m. to 4 p.m. at least two staff are on duty on weekdays and three on weekends. In the evening from 4 p.m. to midnight, three staff are on duty every night except Tuesdays, when there are four. One of these is the administrator. At night there is only one person on duty per JRA policy.

On the day of the site visit, there was a teacher and a teacher's aide, the administrator, the program supervisor, the clinical supervisor, at least one residential counselor, the cook, the clerk, and at least three other people who were coming on duty for the evening shift. With the exception of the cook and the clerk, all interact with youth.

Since this is a residential treatment facility, staff are very involved with youth. This includes teachers, direct supervision staff (all certified chemical dependency counselors), and case workers. Administrative staff are chemical dependency counselors as well. In one form or another, all provide treatment for alcohol and drug abuse. This activity goes on most of the resident's waking hours.

Most activity is on-site. However, at the time of the site visit, youths who had earned staff approval could walk down the road half a mile. They went with a staff's nod and by themselves. They had a set amount of time to go down and back. As of September 1, youth could no longer walk down the road by themselves.

As part of their treatment, residents are off site five nights a week attending AA/NA meetings, generally in Cle Elum and Ellensburg. Staff expect them to learn during the four weeks in the program that attendance at AA meetings is necessary to their recovery and that they gain something from being there. Only one staff takes residents to meetings. They have no more than six residents under their supervision and carry a cell phone in case of emergency. However, that person has no immediate backup if something goes wrong.

Residents also participate in some recreation off site. For example, they go to the community swimming pool in the summer. They used to go to more places but have become unwelcome as local residents become more uneasy about offenders. No off-site time is unsupervised.

COMMUNITY RISK ASSESSMENT

Because this is a 30-day residential treatment program, and because community risk assessments are scheduled every 90 days, residents are not at Parke Creek long enough to have a risk assessment while they are in the program.

VIOLATIONS AND INFRACTIONS

When it is at capacity, the facility sees 195 youths a year. There are new residents nearly every other day. They stay only 30 days for drug and alcohol treatment. Parke Creek does not use the level system. The program has many operating rules and staff keep close tabs on the residents; thus, resulting in minor incidents. Serious rule violations include escape, staff or peer assaults, failure to follow staff orders, destruction of property, and four or more minor violations. A serious rule violation results in removal from the program.

Incident records are kept in a separate file drawer, one file for each resident. The six files examined during the site visit all contained incidents. One case involved a resident arguing with another. No action was taken beyond the warning. Another involved horseplay acknowledged by staff as a serious problem; the resident was advised this could be a major rule violation, i.e., disorderly conduct. No further action was taken.

One youth approached the lifeguard at the swimming pool. Staff are very concerned about losing access to the pool and have warned youth to minimize interaction. He was warned and the group left early.

Two youth were found smoking and with cigarettes. Both were returned to a JRA institution. One was depressed and said he didn't want treatment and was unwilling to have mental health intervention. He was returned to Yakima Detention.

Since these youths are involved in drug/alcohol treatment, smoking is considered a serious problem. The resident interviewed said that if you smoke cigarettes four times you will be returned to JRA. He knew someone to whom that had happened. The primary reference in the rules to cigarettes concerns bumming cigarettes at AA/NA meetings. Cigarettes are also considered drugs, and drug use is forbidden.

ESCAPE PROCEDURES

Parke Creek averages one escape a year, but have had two in the last year. An escape is defined per JRA Bulletin #17 and JRA procedures are followed. Neighbors are alerted if a resident escapes from the facility.

The two escapes this year were quite different. One walked out through the front door at night. He was caught and returned to Maple Lane where he again escaped.

The second crawled out a bathroom window while at an AA meeting. A staff person was standing outside the door and unaware there was a window large enough for the youth to escape. Parke Creek can only afford to take one staff person to AA meetings, so he called the escape in by telephone, returned to the group, and took the remaining youths back to the facility. The escapee was picked up some weeks later hitching through Ellensburg from Seattle to Spokane.

VISITING

Visiting is encouraged. The administrator places a heavy emphasis on the importance of families, i.e., parents, significant others, and children. He tries to make family visiting possible. Visitation is usually Sunday afternoon; however, every other week treatment includes a two-day family group. This occurs on the weekend and is limited to those chosen by staff.

Counselors approve visitors as part of the treatment process. Visiting occurs in an area that is always supervised by staff. No touching is permitted.

JRA MONITORING

Management states that JRA performance reviews occur as needed. The last was in March 1996. They have never had an unannounced review or one at night or on weekends. To their knowledge, no JRA staff has contacted neighbors, schools, employers, or law enforcement. However, Parke Creek staff communicate with all these groups.

As a certified drug and alcohol treatment facility, Parke Creek is subject to review by the state Division of Alcohol and Drug Abuse. At the time of the site visit, they were also preparing for an ACA accreditation visit in October 1998.

RELATIONS WITH THE COMMUNITY

Parke Creek plans to put together a community advisory board and have already identified the key members. The plan is to meet quarterly. The board will be informed about the type of residents and the program and be asked for feedback about community concerns.

They do not expect the advisory board to review individual youth since the turnover is so rapid. Restrictions are also imposed under federal confidentiality regulations regarding people

receiving drug/alcohol treatment. They also doubt community members would be willing to do any actual screening.

Parke Creek has a conditional land use permit that requires yearly renewal. At the last review, there was no negative response; in fact, no one appeared to testify.

Parke Creek residents do not attend school or have jobs outside the facility.

Neighbors

The facility has very few neighbors, but staff believe they have good relationships with those they do have. Interaction occurs as the opportunity arises. Time is also spent with other members of the community.

Written surveys were sent to four neighbors. Three were returned. All three respondents rated the facility a “good neighbor.” One neighbor commented that staff have sometimes stopped by to ask if there are any problems or concerns.

PUGET SOUND CENTER TACOMA, WASHINGTON

FACILITY AND NEIGHBORHOOD DESCRIPTION

The Puget Sound Center is licensed as a 20-bed community residential facility which provides services only to JRA. It is operated by Gateways for Youth and Families. The facility is located in Tacoma, Washington, next to the Gateways headquarters building. JRA contracts for 16 beds and will place as many as 18 youth at Puget Sound Center. There were 15 JRA youth in residence on the day of the site visit. All residents are adolescent males.

Gateways is the largest private provider of community residential beds in the state for JRA. Until recently, Gateways operated three facilities for JRA: the Puget Sound Center, Dyslin's Boys Ranch, and Forest Ridge Lodge. Because of decreased referrals from JRA, Forest Ridge Lodge (which had taken up to 26 JRA youth) and an 8-bed unit at Dyslin's Boys Ranch have been closed. Puget Sound Center and the main facility at Dyslin's Boys Ranch (licensed for up to 26 youth) remain open. Gateways plans to re-open the 8-bed facility at Dyslin's as a facility for DCFS referrals. The lease on the Forest Ridge Lodge was not renewed. Even with the loss of these beds, Gateway remains JRA's largest private provider of community residential beds.

The facility is located in the Oakland Park neighborhood of Tacoma. The neighborhood consists of modest, single family residences displaying mixed pride of ownership and some newer apartment buildings. Residences are confined to a several-block-wide residential strip between Highway 16 and Center Street. The site itself is quite large (approximately six acres) and is visually isolated from the neighborhood by trees and a change in elevation. A long curving driveway winds through trees to a large, flat clearing on the top of a small hill. Ample room is provided for parking, outdoor recreation (both covered and open), and for the residential center and the adjacent Gateways office building. The northern edge of the property abuts the Highway 16 right-of-way. The facility is not visible from the highway, but traffic sounds can be heard on the site.

The facility is a single-story, wood frame structure with brick facing. There are two housing wings: one with three bedrooms and the other with five. The larger housing wing has one single room; all other bedrooms are either double or triple occupancy. The facility was built as a group home and has a good layout for observation of public spaces. Appropriate spaces are provided for staff offices and other staff functions. The common areas are sized appropriately for the number of youth housed at the Center.

FACILITY SECURITY

Physical elements of security are limited. There are alarms on all exterior doors and exterior lights on all sides of the building are activated by motion detectors. Several of the lights went on as we walked around the building. A demonstration of the door alarm system showed that it was in working order.

Windows in the bedrooms are the weak link in the security system. Fly screens can be removed, and a person can easily step out onto the ground. Some youth have escaped from Puget Sound Center this way; however, leaving the building to hid and smoke cigarettes is the most common reason why boys have gone out through the windows at Puget Sound Center. There has been discussion, but no decision by the Gateways organization, to add window alarms in the bedrooms. Gateways does not want to add video monitoring cameras.

While physical elements of security are limited, staff security seems very good. The director obviously views this as a high priority. Security procedures are thorough, and record keeping appears to be excellent.

STAFFING

The Puget Sound Center has at least one case manager and one child care worker on duty from 7 a.m. to 3 p.m. and three to four staff on duty from 3 p.m. to 11 p.m. Two awake staff are on duty at night from 11 p.m. to 7 a.m. Daytime staff are increased on the weekend. A cook is on duty during the day, seven days per week. One to two administrative staff are on duty during normal business hours Monday through Friday. The Director and Assistant Director share on-call responsibilities.

Pay differentials between community residential centers and state employment in similar positions was cited as a major contributor to staff turnover at the Puget Sound Center. The director estimated that the Center had lost about ten staff to public sector jobs during the last two and a half years. Since the entire staff complement (excluding cooks and administrative staff) is 13, this represents a very high turnover rate.

COMMUNITY RISK ASSESSMENT

Community risk assessments are conducted every 90 days on JRA youth. The assessments are completed by a team led by the CRP Coordinator. The team consists of the CRP Coordinator, the director, the case manager, the resident, and others. Use of a team approach for doing community risk assessments was started early in 1998.

It was reported that, until relatively recently, juveniles with a community risk assessment score a few points above 20 could sometimes receive a waiver to remain at a community residential facility. Waivers are no longer given. Sentiment has been expressed that this is sometimes unfair to the juvenile. For example, it was said that a youth will sometimes get in trouble with a specific staff person for reasons that have more to do with the staff person than the youth. But the youth is scored, not the staff person. If there are enough base points in the initial risk assessment (items J and K on the CRA), even a small change will cause the youth to exceed 20 points. Furthermore, it was stated that the risk assessment tool tends to overlap in some areas. If the score goes up for one factor, it can go up for another.

Information about the behavior of youths at school or work is obtained by the case manager. Program policy calls for site-checks at school or employment at least twice a month. According to the director, site-checks are usually more frequent than this. Telephone checks, and reports by teachers and employers, occur more frequently. Teachers and employers are required to sign forms agreeing to report absences, tardiness, and unacceptable behavior by JRA youth. After this policy was implemented, one post-secondary school (Bates Technical College) refused to sign the forms. Because of this, Bates is no longer used by JRA youth at Puget Sound Center. The Center reported some problems with inconsistent notification by one of the alternative schools in the Tacoma School District. The regular high schools used by Puget Sound Center youth (Foss and Lincoln) are reporting that they do not have room for Puget Sound Center youth in the upcoming school year.

Case files were reviewed on two JRA youth currently in residence at Puget Sound Center. Community risk assessments for both youth were on file and current.

VIOLATIONS AND INFRACTIONS

The Puget Sound Center keeps track of “incidents” rather than violations or infractions. While violations and infractions are a subset of incidents, incidents include other matters of importance to the operation of the program. Copies of incident reports are kept both in individual case files and in a master file.

The Puget Sound Center uses a level system for rewarding and “consequencing” positive and negative behavior. The level system, rules and expectations, and consequences are all described in a Resident Handbook. The one resident who was interviewed was clearly aware of the rules, expectations, and consequences. While he thought some of the rules were “nonsense” (e.g., the no smoking policy), he said that the rules were fairly enforced. He was also aware of the appeals process but said that residents feel powerless and have to be very careful.

The master file of incident reports was reviewed to determine how many, and what kinds of, incidents occurred during FY 97. Four months, staggered throughout the year, were reviewed. During these four months, there were a total of 42 incident reports, of which at least nine were incidents other than rule violations. If this rate of incidents is typical for the year, there would have been 126 incidents in FY 97. This is very close to the 133 reported by the program in its self assessment. These 42 reports were all read and classified by type as follows:

INCIDENT REPORTS AT PUGET SOUND CENTER July 1996, October 1996, January 1997, April 1997

TYPE OF INCIDENT	NUMBER
Alleged new crime	1
Escape	3
Behavior - escape risk	3
Assault / fighting	3
Unaccounted for time	3
Threatening / verbal confrontation	6
Refusal to follow directions	3
Behavior – other	2
Property damage	1
Smoking	4
Horseplay	4
Subtotal	33
Not an infraction	9
Total	42

While such judgements are always subjective, if one considers the first five types of incidents to be serious, and all others (except “not an infraction”) to be minor, then about 80 percent of all incidents are rule violations. Of these, about 40 percent are serious rule violations and 60 percent are minor.

According to the survey by the WSIPP, there were 16 returns to JRA institutions from Puget Sound Center in FY 97.

ESCAPE PROCEDURES

Gateways policy number 2.03 defines escape procedures for the agency. An escapee is defined as a resident whose whereabouts have become unknown. There is no specified time limit for how long an absence must be to constitute an escape. It was reported that escape procedures are initiated as soon as it becomes known that a resident is unaccounted for, although checks are usually first made to determine that the absence is not just a communication problem. If the resident shows up late because of a bus change or other explainable reason, escape procedures can be cancelled.

The escape reporting procedure calls for staff to notify the police, program director, JRA Officer of the Day or CRP Coordinator, and the youth's parents or guardian. Victim notification is made through the Victim/Witness Program at Maple Lane School. Oakridge Group Home is notified to initiate the arrest warrant process.

The Gateways escape policy also includes a list of "causes" of escape that staff are to monitor to help prevent escapes. These include such things as crisis situations for the youth, withdrawal, retaliation against the program or outsiders, and peer rejection.

According to JRA data, there were seven escapes from Puget Sound Center in FY 97. There were five during the first 10 months of FY 98.

VISITING

Visiting takes place on Saturday and Sunday afternoons in the public areas of the building and grounds. Non-family visitors must be within staff sight at all times. The number and type of visitors a resident may have depends on the resident's level. There are five levels in Puget Sound Center's level system. At the lowest two levels, a resident may have visits from family members only. At levels three and four, visits are limited to family members and an approved "significant other" (i.e. girl friend). At the highest level, approved friends may also visit.

JRA MONITORING

Puget Sound Center receives annual performance reviews by JRA. The last review occurred in June 1998. This and previous reviews were read. The Puget Sound Center has gotten generally very positive reviews by JRA. All reviews occur during normal business hours, Monday through Friday.

The JRA CRP Coordinator is on-site at the Puget Sound Center about ten hours per week. The CRP visits all occur during normal business hours, Monday through Friday. Most of the time he is at the facility two to three times per week. The present CRP Coordinator has been in that position for about 15 months.

RELATIONS WITH THE COMMUNITY

Schools

Puget Sound Center residents attend Foss High School, an alternative high school, Tacoma Community College, and a local art school.

The vice principal at Foss High School said that Puget Sound Center staff are "very responsive," "accessible immediately," and "right on top of it." She said that the students are "just fine." The

Foss vice principal also used to work at the alternative school. She said that Puget Sound Center students “worked out great there, too.”

The director at Art for Youth was less positive in her assessment. While there haven’t been “significant problems,” she said that Puget Sound Center residents generally “need more attention” than other students. She said that some of them are loud. During the summer term there were three or four Puget Sound Center residents in a class of 25 at Art for Youth. The school would like to have Puget Sound Center provide an on-site case aid if more than one youth is in the program.

There was an incident involving a Puget Sound Center student at the end of summer session that “could have been serious.” This student became the focus of hostility from another boy who turned out to be a gang member and who tried to “enroll” other gang members in the school in an effort (according to the director) to beat up the Puget Sound Center student.

Employers

Four employers of Puget Sound Center residents were successfully contacted. One, the manager of a restaurant, refused to answer any questions.

The manager of an import business hired her first Puget Sound Center resident this summer. She has hired other social service agency referrals with mixed results. Since the Puget Sound Center worker “worked out fine,” she will probably hire another one next summer during the business’ busy season. She also would recommend Puget Sound Center residents to other employers.

The manager of a local McDonald’s has had only one Puget Sound Center worker so far. He describe him as “dependable.” While he has no one from Puget Sound Center working for him now, he intends to hire again from Puget Sound Center when they give him another referral. He said that checks by Puget Sound Center were frequent but “not a hassle.” He reported that he has told other McDonald’s managers about his positive experience.

The manager at a Wendy’s restaurant also was positive in his assessment of the Puget Sound Center residents he has hired.

Law Enforcement

The Community Liaison Officer for the Tacoma Police Department in the area where Puget Sound Center is located reported that Puget Sound Center “used to be a real problem” but that for the past several years there has been little trouble. He reports that staff are “cooperative and helpful.”

Neighbors

Relations with neighbors appear to be excellent. The Puget Sound Center is an active member of the local neighborhood association. The director at Puget Sound Center attends these meetings and made a presentation to the neighborhood group at their August 1998 meeting.

A survey was sent to the 17 addresses believed to be the nearest neighbors. While there were only five responses, all rated the facility as a “good” or “excellent” neighbor. One neighbor stated that there used to be a problem with youths walking down to the end of the driveway and smoking cigarettes in front of his house. This is no longer a problem. Two of the four respondents noted that Puget Sound Center has planted and maintained a traffic circle in the neighborhood.

RIDGEVIEW GROUP HOME YAKIMA, WASHINGTON

FACILITY AND NEIGHBORHOOD DESCRIPTION

Ridgeview Group Home is a 16-bed male facility operated by JRA. The emphasis is on providing residents with the skills they need to avoid further criminal behavior. Residents are assigned to counselors who work out plans with each individual.

This facility has a history of serving both JRA commitments and JRA parolees under the care of DCFS. They stopped taking DCFS youth three years ago. Because they had a high percentage of long term residents, referrals and population did not initially drop following the David Dodge incident. Following this, they went to four JRA beds. The facility administrator has been taking youth other facilities choose not to take: those with short stays, including youth from Parke Creek, and sex offenders. The day of the site visit (August 11, 1998), about half the residents were direct commits. (JRA management directed group homes to stop taking direct commitments as of September 1, 1998.) Average lengths of stay are short by statute. The average length of stay of JRA commitments has also been short: less than three months. This makes for an unstable population.

The facility was built in 1981 for its current purpose as a JRA facility. The administrator responsible for its construction and subsequent operation had worked at Canyon View. The Ridgeview floor plan is a modification of the Canyon View floor plan.

Unlike Parke Creek, Canyon View, and Sunrise, the living space is larger and more open. The TV room is off the main living area and slightly more secluded. There is no classroom. The boys sleep in three rooms off one corridor and five rooms off another. All but one room are multiple occupancy. Most have two occupants. Some have three beds with two occupants. One has three occupants. A staff duty station (called a "kiosk" at Parke Creek) looks out on the living room and dining areas. It has no view into the sleeping areas.

The surrounding neighborhood is largely commercial or multi-occupancy residences. The nearest neighbor is the Yakima County Detention Center. Its back wall serves as a fence to the southwest corner of Ridgeview's lawn. Yakima County owns and leases the land to JRA. Across the street on the north is a nursing home. Beyond the vacant lot and small business on the east is public housing. A DSHS regional office is just down the street.

FACILITY SECURITY

The building is a one-story, wood frame building, which gives the appearance of a residence at first glance. The front door is always locked to prevent unauthorized entry. Residents can exit the building at will during the day but are inhibited by the presence of staff. The fire exit doors off the dining room and the kitchen have alarms, but during daytime hours, the alarms are deactivated. Staff in the office, and the cook, can observe the door exiting from the dining room. The cook can also see the kitchen door while she is in the kitchen. Across the back of the primary living area are a sunroom and a row of sliding glass doors. These are locked at night. At other time youth are free to go into the back yard and play basketball.

The windows in areas frequented by the youth do not open. One corridor has no fire exit. The sleeping rooms have windows with wooden bars. One bar is removable so that occupants can break the glass and escape if there was a fire. Windows in the sleeping area that has a fire exit

are larger. Originally, they opened but are currently sealed shut. All sleeping-area windows are ordinary glass and can be broken to make emergency egress windows.

The exterior of the building is well lighted with solar cell lights. The camera off the back corner of the Detention Center sweeps most of the back and west side of the building. There are no cameras in the front or east.

The back yard is fenced. The fence is a common wood fence, such as would be found in a residence, and is not a deterrent to escape. A youth jumped the fence the day after it was installed. The front is not fenced.

Staff who are driving residents to appointments have radios in their vans. Those without radios have cellular phones. The radios connect to the staff office. Staff on the graveyard shift wear panic buttons so they can call for help.

STAFFING

The number of staff actively supervising youth reaches a peak in late afternoons and on weekend days. Starting at six in the morning, two staff are on duty; after seven, this includes the administrator. At 1:30 p.m. three are present to give staff a time to catch up on what is happening. By 2 p.m., two staff plus the administrator work a normal day. Between 4 p.m. and 9:30 p.m., three staff are on duty, not including the administrator. From 10 p.m. to 6 a.m. when youth are in the rooms, only one staff is on duty. During weekdays, the cook and the secretary are also there.

During the days and evenings, staff take residents to school, to AA/NA meetings, to treatment appointments, and to work. All residents work either as volunteers or for pay. As a result, only one staff may be on duty at the facility when residents are at work.

Four regular JRA counselors, one aide, a "night man," a supervisor, and one administrator maintain what is essentially two posts 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. Intermittent staff provide relief. The day of the site visit there was a staff vacancy, and an intermittent staff person was working. He has worked at the facility on and off for three years, including what was virtually full-time work during one several-month period. He hopes to be hired to fill the vacancy.

Staff levels are such that staff meetings no longer include all staff. Residents during the interview mentioned that staff meetings did not occur, and the administrator confirmed their perception.

COMMUNITY RISK ASSESSMENT

The administrator thinks the CRA is "pretty good." He does not find the institutional interview process a good use of time or money. Instead, he looks at a potential referral's CRA to see whether the youth has been non-compliant or had poor progress in treatment areas.

A group, including the assigned counselor, the supervisor, and one other staff person, completes community risk assessments. At least every two weeks, counselors contact treatment providers, schools, and other community members who regularly interact with the youth. This information becomes part of the assessments. The Parole Officer is also consulted.

A check of five records revealed few CRAs in the case files. Only one youth had a CRA on file. Three residents had not been there long enough to have a CRA completed by the facility's staff; another should have had one in the previous month, but did not.

VIOLATIONS AND INFRACTIONS

Ridgeview uses a level system. Given the relatively short length of time in the program, level progression is not much of an incentive. Room restrictions appeared to be the preferred lesser sanction. Some behavior was written up and did not result in any sanction. Instead, staff included it in the next review. Serious infractions result in a return to JRA. Some youth are returned to an institution temporarily.

The residents interviewed said they did not always know the rules and that different staff required different behaviors. They alleged that the handbook included a minority of the behaviors that could get you in trouble with one staff person or another. The list of behavioral expectations is a mixture that ranges from not chewing gum to possession of drugs. It has some catchall categories—following the rules of the group home and promptly obeying all staff directives—that can be interpreted as staff chooses. The handbook does not indicate sanctions.

The administrator described several incidents. One involved a youth flashing gang signs, which resulted in the youth losing access to activities outside the facility. He also mentioned a resident who played hooky from school, driving around with friends for over four hours. In that case, the administrator saw the youth and followed him for some time, honking and asking him to stop, without success. This youth was returned to a JRA institution.

A review of the incident log revealed only five incident reports between October 1996 and the site visit. (Incident reports are on loose sheets and could have been out of chronological order.) Some horseplay in June became a subject during the review process. There was an incident in November in which residents were speaking Spanish, some staff thought using swear words. (Only the administrator and one other staff person speak Spanish.) When reprimanded, the youths became "obnoxious with staff" and were restricted for a week. A fight at school between a resident and an ex-resident was reported, but any sanction was unclear. A DCFS youth that was a runaway for three days was spotted by a staff person who reported him to the police. The youth was returned to the group home where he threatened the staff who had reported him. There was apparently no sanction for either the threat or the running away. One youth vandalized a car parked at a restaurant, and a police report was filed.

Residents reported that assaults and possession of marijuana could get you sent back to the institution. They knew of two people who had been sent back while they were there. All three of those interviewed had been in the facility less than three months.

During the site visit, an incident was in progress. One of the youths interviewed was suspected of possession of marijuana. A search of his room did find contraband. All residents had given urine samples the previous morning. He had required an excessive amount of time to produce a specimen and complained to me that staff made him late for his off-site activity. Shortly after my interview, he was taken to the Detention Center for transfer to a JRA institution. Police would file no charges because staff could not ascertain whether he had placed the marijuana under his mattress or whether another youth had done so.

ESCAPE PROCEDURES

Escape is defined by Ridgeview as “any unauthorized absence from approved program.” An absence can be considered an escape immediately or up to four hours later, depending upon the circumstances. Staff may look for the youth. The administrator told of two incidents where staff knew the whereabouts of a missing youth. The intermittent staff person could quickly recite the procedure to follow in case of escape, including whom to notify and in what order.

Escapes generally occur off-site while at school or community activities. Some months ago, a youth walked away from the facility during morning cleanup. (Two staff are on duty at that hour.) The youth who jumped the fence was a JRA parole revocation.

The administrator believes that almost all recent unapprehended escapes are illegal, monolingual Hispanics who sell drugs to survive and who expect to be caught by the INS and returned to their country of origin. It was reported that the program will not take this type of youth in the future.

VISITING

Visiting is daily between the hours of 10 a.m. and 8 p.m. This schedule recognizes the school and work schedules of residents. Visitors are family and friends approved by staff. Visitors for residents under 18 are cleared with parents. Visits are always supervised and in the public areas. Touching is not allowed. It was reported that the biggest problem with visitation is parents who are intoxicated.

JRA MONITORING

The last formal performance review of Ridgeview was in 1996. It was reported that they have had unannounced visits and audits by JRA staff but no unscheduled reviews.

RELATIONS WITH THE COMMUNITY

Ridgeview does not have an advisory board at present but is putting one together. They already relate to their neighboring retirement community, providing some community service there. All residents must do volunteer work, at the Salvation Army and elsewhere. They perform cleanup at a neighborhood park, and litter pickup on a nearby stretch of highway.

Schools

Ridgeview residents attend several different Yakima schools. The principal of the Alternative School reported that they have two youth in their program now. They have had no trouble with Ridgeview residents, who are generally well behaved when in or around the school. They report good rapport with the staff.

The principal of the high school says they have some Ridgeview residents and youths from the four other community residential facilities in Yakima. He has no memory or sense of any trouble with Ridgeview residents. The person from The Learning Center stated they had positive relations and history with Ridgeview residents and staff.

Employers

Ridgeview places its residents with the Salvation Army, United Way, and the YMCA. The Salvation Army staff reported that all the youth sent by Ridgeview have been courteous, upbeat, and well-mannered. They have had no problems, and have a good impression of Ridgeview.

The United Way had one project in which two residents worked as volunteers. It was a positive experience with good two-way interaction between United Way and Ridgeview staff. The United Way spokesman now sits on Ridgeview's Board.

The YMCA staff have had Ridgeview residents in their programs for the last several years. They participate in projects and activities, perform cleanup and beautification programs. It has been a "great partnership."

Two residents have worked at the Settlers Inn in the last year. It was described as a good experience by the manager. Settlers Inn has renewed their agreements regarding each resident. The staff contacts have been good, although there has been infrequent direct contact with staff. Residents also have worked at Burger King where there is a new manager, who had heard of no complaints about Ridgeview residents.

Justice Agency Representatives

Ridgeview is in the City of Yakima. The person responding from Yakima Police Department was a community-policing officer who works as a liaison between the department and Ridgeview. It was reported that the Chief receives notices of new residents or of residents leaving. Copies are distributed to both detectives and patrol personnel. The officer was not aware of any problems at the facility.

The Juvenile Court Administrator described a good working relationship with the Ridgeview manager. She says there is only minimum impact on the court's workload or on detention from the group home.

Neighbors

The neighbors are businesses, juvenile detention, and public housing. The manager of the Yakima Housing Authority says they have had no bad history with the facility. She wasn't even aware they existed until a phone call last summer telling her that we would be calling.

The Yakima County Juvenile Detention staff report a good working relationship with Ridgeview's director. They serve on each other's interview committees and watch out for each other. An example of this is a situation where the detention facility's faulty fire alarm was monitored by Group Home staff while it was being fixed. They have had no problems nor have they observed maintenance or operations issues.

The Good Samaritan Nursing Home staff also reports a positive history with the facility and its staff. They have had no problems with residents. The program seems well run. Staff have been to Good Samaritan to speak. She gives Ridgeview high marks.

RIVERVIEW YOUTH CENTER SPOKANE, WASHINGTON

FACILITY AND NEIGHBORHOOD DESCRIPTION

Riverview is a 17-bed residential facility serving only JRA boys. It was founded in 1981 by JRA staff and was the first community residential facility (CRF) in the state. JRA staff did not want a facility that mixed JRA and other types of youth, although they did take a few DCFS youth in the early days of the facility. Their argument is that they have less leverage with DCFS residents and that the difference adversely affects the behavior of JRA residents.

The idea behind the creation of Riverview was to create a sense of group camaraderie. The resulting program has many parallels with residential therapeutic communities (TC), such as those run by drug treatment agencies both inside and outside of prisons. TCs function like a total community, i.e., an institution that strips one of an original identity and replaces it with another. Staff spend considerable time helping residents develop a new, more pro-social sense of self, especially as a member of Riverview. They use daily group meetings and situations in which the group members have to work together. For example, they take camping trips with Outward Bound-type activities. They prefer older, more criminogenic JRA youths with stays of a year or more. With the passage of E2SSB 6445 and the ensuing changes, their lengths of stay have dropped far below this to an average of only a few months.

The facility itself is a two plus-story brick and frame house, probably constructed in the late 1800s. Before its current use, it was a home for wards of the court and delinquent youth. A previous owner wrapped a wooden addition around three sides. This addition provides room for a kitchen, dining room, resident rooms and staff operations. It includes a deck that serves as another way into the house.

On the first floor in the older portion of the house there is a living room, a front hall, a bath, another small office, a room for a pop machine, storage and phone calls, and two toilet/shower rooms. The second floor shows the facility's age. At the top of the narrow, steep stairway are a one-person landing and three bedrooms. Each room has more than one occupant, sleeping in bunk beds. Two more bedrooms are in the partial daylight basement. One bedroom has two residents, one has three, and three have four. They all are very crowded.

Over the years, Riverview has purchased four adjoining pieces of property creating a quadrant. The original house sits in the northwest sector. The house in the northeast sector is now used for returning alumni. A portion is rented. A duplex on the southeast corner is used for staff offices and treatment rooms. Another house on the southwest corner will be converted to independent living.

Prior to the current changes with JRA's use of community residential facilities, Riverview planned a new facility to replace the old house. It had a permit and was ready to proceed. The intent was to move forward as quickly as possible. Their current loss of revenue (they were down to nine residents on the day of the site visit and had lost almost \$100,000) led the board to delay the project. They are, however, continuing with their plans.

Riverview sits in a transition neighborhood. Behind it, and up a steep slope, are railroad tracks. Below, and beside it, is a small area of modest homes and apartments, running along the Spokane River. Nearby is an industrial area. Around the corner is the power company office.

FACILITY SECURITY

As with any facility of this type, the doors cannot be locked. The facility has no surveillance devices, depending solely on what staff can see or hear. They believe that their expectations for residents imply something other than physical security. They are planning to use cameras and audio monitors in the new building as well as have better sight lines from the staff office to residential and common areas.

The upstairs bedrooms have double casement windows. All four bedrooms exit either directly onto a fire escape or onto the roof of the addition and then to a fire escape. Once on the roof of the addition, they can also drop to the deck and from there to the ground and away from the building. The ground level residential room is in the addition. The ground level has aluminum frame windows that open easily. The doors from the basement open onto the grounds. The perimeter and the road have lighting.

STAFFING

During the day, when most youth are at school or work, two staff are on duty and responsible for supervising youth or providing programs. Anybody not in school or work is expected to perform community service. In the evening, there are three staff on duty. At night there are two. On weekends the number drops to one during the day on Sunday and two during the evening period.

Staff describe their jobs as follows: During the day and evening, they teach and help with job searches. After program, they interact less formally with residents until lights-out at 10 p.m. on weekdays and midnight on weekends. They do lots of room checks. Evening and weekend days are more of what graveyard does at the start of that shift but also includes group, one-on-one discussions, and regularly scheduled programs, such as anger management, changing criminal thinking errors, and volunteer service in the community. On weekends, Riverview youth work for Habitat for Humanity and do other things to return something to the community.

This is minimal staffing, particularly given the other attributes of the facility. Still, it seems to work reasonably well for them. The primary reason is their use of groups, peer pressure, and the TC model. With a low turnover, they can rely on residents with more tenure to provide leadership to the newer residents. The older residents have a stake in keeping the incident level low and in seeing that new residents take advantage of Riverview's program. They play a key role in keeping the pressure on their peers. In addition, staff are expected to interact with residents all the time. During this interaction, they get a strong sense of who is doing well and who is not. They use this to assess progress and to anticipate problems as early as possible. The record of this is the "P grades."

COMMUNITY RISK ASSESSMENT

The P grade reports were being done before the community risk assessment (CRA) and are not coordinated with the CRA. In fact, when I first started looking at files, I thought they were a version of the risk assessment because they treat daily behavior as clues to risk. P grade reports include information from others outside the facility. Riverview staff members think the risk assessment lacks some critical elements if it is to be used with youths on community placement. For example, it says nothing about being technically AWOL.

Risk assessments are done regularly and sometimes with greater frequency than called for by JRA regulations. Staff note that getting information from schools and employers can be difficult. Outsiders can think that Riverview is too hard on its residents and not want to share what they know. There are consequences to having a high-risk assessment score. If a resident scores over 20, he must have a plan to reduce that score. If he scores over 20 twice, he is returned to the institution.

VIOLATIONS AND INFRACTIONS

Riverview uses the level system. During the last year, 142 incidents occurred, and all resulted in a change of level. Five resulted in a return to the institution.

The rules are simple. There are only 13: non-compliance, threatening a staff or peer, drug or alcohol abuse, sexual acting out, run plans, physical aggressiveness towards others, self-destructive behavior, technical AWOL, horse play, any behavior deemed inappropriate or behavior that continues after staff intervention, community program failure (i.e., loss of job or school placement), being absent from group without being excused, and any adverse contact with the community.

The incident reports reflect the same. The five records reviewed included three cases in which the resident collected P grades; one had enough to have a level reduction. They got P grades for not making their bed, for having trouble with staff, and other fairly minor incidents.

One resident had more serious incidents. He took someone's belongings and got a room isolation period. He pushed another resident and got more room time. A fifth resident was a drug user and started to drink and use nutmeg. He had one incident after another over a period of several months. He lost levels and was put on security watch where he was checked more frequently. They did risk assessments with increasing frequency. Finally he went AWOL and was drinking. They sent him back to JRA but expect to see him again within 20 days if he does well.

The resident who was interviewed gave a very revealing answer to the question, "What would get someone in big trouble here?" He said, "Thinking they don't need more help ... Dishonesty gets me in trouble." He said, "Staff are willing to give you a chance if you don't lie about it." When pressed, he knew the rules and the consequences but that wasn't what was most important to him.

ESCAPE PROCEDURES

A youth is considered on escape status when he has "deviated for any length of time from his assigned programming," i.e., job, school, residence. He is considered an escapee as soon as he is not at the assigned location. In the last year, four youth have escaped.

One escape was the resident mentioned above who went AWOL. He stayed after work and went drinking with friends. When he returned, he found out that there was a warrant for his arrest and that he was returning to JRA. Another escape was from the house. Late at night a resident went down the fire escape and up the slope to the railroad tracks. The staff person on duty went to check and found him missing in time to see him clear the top of the slope. He followed the procedure for notifying JRA, etc., then he took off after the youth. The staff member wasn't quick enough to catch the youth, but he was found fairly soon.

VISITING

Visiting occurs in the afternoon on Saturday and Sunday and again Saturday evenings. Visitors are limited to immediate family members and others approved by the program manager. Approvals are based on the manager's interview of the potential visitor and the resident. All visits are supervised.

JRA MONITORING

JRA staff have an investment in this program: they started it. It shows in the attention they give it, even when the present JRA staff includes few from the group that originally began the program. JRA staff do performance reviews every other year. They did the last one in February 1996. They have had an unannounced review made by the CRP coordinator in March 1998. The coordinator does appear at night. Riverview staff are not aware of any contacts JRA has made with neighbors, schools, employers, or law enforcement.

RELATIONS WITH THE COMMUNITY

Like many community residential facility administrators, Riverview's management staff say they keep a low profile in their neighborhood. They have, however, obtained a permit for their new facility which required notice to neighbors. There were two hearings regarding the permit. The hearing examiner received 30 letters, all of them favorable to Riverview. Those who appeared to testify at the first hearing were favorable to the permit. At the zoning hearing, there were no adverse comments, only favorable ones.

The program has a local board of directors.

Schools

Staff at Bridge, the JRA Learning Center, and at the area's high school responded to questions about relationships between the schools and Riverview. Both described their relationships as very positive. They perceive Riverview as matching students to the best learning environment for them. They felt free to say that their school was not the best place for a particular resident. They saw no problems with the school agreement form and the requirements it places on the school. (One did state that the agreement had been signed some years earlier and was not renewed each year.)

The Riverview staff report they are in regular communication with school staff. In the high school, this communication is more intense early in the school year and less intense as residents settle into school. In Bridge, where the students have more problems with learning, the interaction includes bimonthly meetings with school and Riverview staff.

The biggest problem for the regular high school staff is that Riverview youth want to be normal and cannot be. They are prohibited from leaving campus and from dating. The biggest problem for Bridge staff is that Riverview youth have problems in class, they are mouthy, and refuse to do their schoolwork.

Employers

Employers rave about the Riverview residents. All that were contacted think Riverview residents are good workers and a reliable source of employees. They will continue to hire them.

They have no problems with the employer agreement forms and interact with the Riverview staff who call or stop by about once a week or so. They acknowledge that some of these kids are not going to become journeymen, but those youth do not last long. Their relationships with Riverview are such that they can call and say, "This kid isn't working out."

Justice Agency Representatives

Riverview is in the City of Spokane. Questions about the facility were referred to Lt. Terry Leliberte whose section, among other things, takes reports on runaways and manages sex offender notification. He said that neither JRA nor the facility notify the Spokane Police Department that Riverview has a new resident but that sex offender registration follows the current legal requirements. Runaways (i.e., escapes) would be reported to this unit. To the knowledge of the person taking such reports, Riverview has not reported a runaway.

The Juvenile Court Administrator for Spokane County states that the community residential facilities have little impact on the court, his probation services, or detention.

Neighbors

Managers at the facility say they interact with the neighborhood association.

Written surveys were sent to five neighbors; only one responded. This person rated the facility as an "excellent neighbor" and wrote, "It is managed very well."

RUTH DYKEMAN CHILDREN'S CENTER BURIEN, WASHINGTON

FACILITY AND NEIGHBORHOOD DESCRIPTION

The Ruth Dykeman Children's Center is a specialized treatment facility for severely disabled children and adolescents located in Burien, Washington. The program serves both boys and girls. Because of the type of services that are provided, the program likes to have patients who will stay six months or longer. The program is licensed for 32 beds and is accredited by the Council of Accreditation of Services for Families and Children. JRA contracts for four beds. There is no minimum guarantee in the JRA contract. The Dykeman Center also takes DCFS and private placement patients. Three JRA youth were in residence at the time of the site visit.

The Ruth Dykeman Center began operation in 1921 but has been a residential treatment facility for only the last 20 years or so. The program occupies a number of buildings of varying age and quality on a large parcel of land on Lake Burien. Adolescent boys live in one of the older buildings. This building is licensed for 12 residents. Adolescent girls live in the newest building, licensed for 14 residents. A small co-ed children's program is located in the same building that houses the administrative offices. The Center plans to replace all of the older housing as funds become available. There is also a gym and various outdoor recreation areas, including a dock on the lake.

The facility is approached from SW 152nd street. Neighbors on this side of the Center include single family residences, apartment buildings, and a church. There are a number of smaller commercial establishments on SW 152nd just to the east of the Center. Neighbors along the lakeshore are all expensive, single-family residences.

FACILITY SECURITY

Security depends mainly on staff supervision. Some exterior doors are equipped with alarms, and all the windows in the living areas open only far enough to permit ventilation. Some of the rooms used for higher-risk youth are equipped with motion detectors. The site is illuminated at night.

The adolescent boys residence is a large, old house from the original Dykeman estate. The building has several blind corners and is difficult to supervise. As a result, video cameras have been added in some hallways so that staff can monitor activities around the corner. The new girls' unit was designed to eliminate these problems. The staff duty office in the new building has excellent visual supervision of all public areas and down the bedroom corridors. The Center intends to use this design concept for other housing in the future.

STAFFING

The Dykeman Center has a very large staff: 47 full-time employees and 15 part-time employees are listed in the program's self assessment. The average full-time employee has worked at the Center for nearly five years. A number of senior staff have worked there for ten or more years. Part-time employees have worked for the Center for an average of just under two years.

JRA youth in residence are all adolescents and almost always boys. Consequently, many employees do not work with JRA youth or work with them very infrequently. It was reported that

the typical number of staff on duty who have responsibility for supervising or providing programs to juvenile offenders is three on the day shift on weekdays, five in the evening on weekdays, and two at night seven days per week. On the weekend, there are four staff on duty on both the day and evening shifts who have such responsibilities. Typically, an additional 15 staff are on duty during normal business hours Monday through Friday and two on call on the weekends.

COMMUNITY RISK ASSESSMENT

The associate director and the supervisor of the adolescent boys program were unaware of the JRA community risk assessment form or procedure. They speculated that this is something that is done by the CRP Coordinator. The program does, however, conduct quarterly meetings to assess the progress that residents are making. The CRP Coordinator attends these meetings.

According to the CRP Coordinator, community risk assessments are completed by the CRP Coordinator, the youth's primary counselor, and a social worker. No counselors or social workers were interviewed during the site visit. The CRP Coordinator reported that risk assessments have been completed by team review for at least as long as he has been the CRP Coordinator at Dykeman Center (i.e., since November 1994).

Case files were reviewed for the three JRA youth in residence at the time of the site visit. None of the youths had been in the program long enough to have needed a community risk assessment. However, only one of them (a transfer from a closed program at the Ryther Child Center) had any historical CRA forms in his case file. The other two youths also had no legal materials on file.

JRA residents each have their own JRA log. Staff noted that JRA youth have more restrictions and fewer privileges than DCFS youth. JRA residents are not permitted to go on some of the outings.

It is not known whether Dykeman Center is using written agreements with schools serving JRA youth. Residents at Dykeman Center do not work off-site; consequently, employer agreements are not needed. Residents are assigned jobs at the Center for which they receive nominal pay.

VIOLATIONS AND INFRACTIONS

The program uses an incident report form to record incidents involving residents. These forms are kept in the case files of individual residents.

None of the JRA youth had any incident reports in their files. One resident had filed a complaint form because another resident had ripped his JRA log apart. The damaged log was in the case file. It should be noted that two of the files were missing all legal materials, community risk assessment forms, and treatment plans. As a result, it cannot be concluded with confidence that these youths were not involved in any incidents, only that there were no incident reports on file.

According to survey data collected by the WSIPP, only three JRA youth were placed at Dykeman Center in FY 97. Two of these were returned to a JRA institution, both for escape.

ESCAPE PROCEDURES

The Dykeman Center defines escape as leaving the grounds without permission or returning late from a pass. Even if the resident returns, if the absence was unauthorized, it can be considered an escape.

Escape procedures specify that the CRP Coordinator, police, and family of the escaped youth be notified.

According to JRA data, there were two escapes from the Dykeman Center in FY 97, and none in FY 98.

VISITING

Visits are made by appointment only. Visiting times and conditions are flexible and are determined by the social worker in charge of the youth. Visits are limited to family members (or guardians) and the youth's probation officer and lawyer. All potential visitors are first screened by the social worker and then placed on an approved visitor list.

JRA MONITORING

A formal review of Dyeman Center is conducted by JRA once a year. The most recent review was reportedly completed in June 1998. We have not seen this review.

The program estimates that the CRP Coordinator is on-site an average of a half-hour per week. None of these visits occur outside normal business hours. It was reported that JRA does periodically contact local schools regarding JRA clients at the Center.

The CRP Coordinator reported that the number of hours he spends at each facility depends on how many youth are in residence. He estimates that he is spends about two to three hours per week at Dykeman Center. This is considerably more than is estimated by the program.

The CRP Coordinator for Dykeman Center is also the CRP Coordinator for Aloha House and Safeco Safe House. While none of these programs has very many JRA youth at one time, the CRP Coordinator has three different groups of staff that he must work with. In addition, since the three programs are very different, time requirements for the referral and recruitment process are also complicated.

RELATIONS WITH THE COMMUNITY

The Dykeman Center has been an established part of the community for nearly 80 years. The program has a Board of Trustees, which includes neighbors as members. The Center is a member of the Lakeshore Community Association and the executive director attends the Association's quarterly meetings. The Lakeshore Community Association hosts events at Christmas and the fourth of July to which children at the Dykeman Center are invited. There is a long-standing women's association, known as "The Guild," that supports the Center. The program has held open houses for school teachers and law enforcement.

Despite these strong ties to the community, management at the Dykeman Center were very clear that participation in screening and admission decisions by a community placement oversight committee would very likely cause the program to terminate its contract with JRA.

Schools

According to an Intervention Specialist at Highline High School, Dykeman Center residents who attend the school generally walk to and from the Center. Staff from the center do occasional on-site checks and provide a quick response if there is a problem. The specialist described the staff as “great to work with.” No significant problems have occurred, and, on the whole, the relationship has been positive.

Employers

No JRA youth at Dykeman Center work off site.

Justice Agency Representatives

Law enforcement was not contacted about the Dykeman Center.

The King County Juvenile Court and Juvenile Probation Service has nothing to do with JRA residents in any of the community residential facilities in King County. They do, however, place juveniles under county jurisdiction at Dykeman Center from time to time. The head of King County Juvenile Probation spoke highly of the program.

Neighbors

The Dykeman Center is on Lake Burien and is a member of the Lakeshore Community Association. According to a Lakeshore neighbor, the center participates in annual events sponsored by the community association. The Dykeman Center loans tables and chairs, and the kids who come to the events are “well behaved.” The woman we spoke with is a member of an organization known as “The Guild,” which helps with fund-raising for the center. According to her, the center has “great control over the kids,” and the neighbors aren’t worried.

BEST PRACTICES

The Ruth Dykeman Children’s Center recently introduced a “Quality Management Team” program. The Center hired an outside consultant to help develop outcome measures. An overall risk assessment was conducted and many physical changes were made. Many of these changes were made to reduce the risk of suicide. Baseline rates for measurable events (e.g. medication errors, use of time out, etc.) were established. The Quality Management Team reviews current performance against the baseline standard on a regular basis.

The program also does its own quarterly health and safety inspections. These steps have been credited by the program for reducing corrective actions required at licensing and other inspections.

OTHER ISSUES

Differences between JRA residents and DCFS residents can be very dramatic. All programs that serve both DCFS youth and JRA youth noted that JRA referrals are much easier to manage than the average DCFS referral. There are several reasons for this.

First, JRA screens juveniles for placement. Only those youth who meet the criteria are placed in the community. It was noted by some programs that JRA referrals are “the cream of the crop.” In contrast, DCFS referrals have usually failed in numerous other interventions and placements. The only major difference is that they haven’t been adjudicated.

In addition, if a JRA youth is in serious violation of program rules, he or she can be sent back to a JRA institution. In some cases, return to an institution is mandatory. No similar sanction is available for DCFS youth. By way of illustration, at the Dykeman Center, if a JRA youth commits an assault on another youth, he will be sent back to an institution. If a DCFS youth commits an assault (assuming no criminal charges are filed), he will be subject to up to four hours room restriction.

SAFECO SAFE HOUSE SEATTLE, WASHINGTON

FACILITY AND NEIGHBORHOOD DESCRIPTION

The Safeco Safe House, operated by Ryther Child Center, is a drug and alcohol recovery center for adolescent boys and girls located in a residential neighborhood in northeast Seattle. The facility has six bedrooms with a licensed capacity of ten. Prior to the fall of 1997, Ryther was under contract with JRA to provide intensive inpatient and/or recovery house services for up to seven JRA youth. Since then, Ryther has stopped providing inpatient services to JRA youth. Services are now limited to the recovery house program for up to four JRA youth. In the meantime, JRA referrals to Ryther Child Center have declined considerably. There were no JRA youth in residence on the day of the site visit.

The facility was built in the 1950s by the Ryther Child Center as a group home for adolescent girls. While its mission has changed from time to time over the years, it has been in continuous use as a group home ever since. It has been a coed recovery house for eight or nine years. Ryther operates a group home for adolescent girls in a similar house a block to the north.

The neighborhood consists of generally well maintained, single family residences. Neighboring houses are of mixed age, size, and quality. The site is near the Seattle city limits, and there are many trees but no sidewalks in the neighborhood. The back of the property abuts a wooded gully formed by Thornton Creek.

The facility has four double occupancy rooms located in a split-level wing at the back of the building. Girls live on one floor and boys on the other. Each floor has its own bathroom and showers. Two additional single bedrooms are located off the living room on the main floor level. There is a recreation room in the basement that has a variety of recreation equipment. Because it was built as a group home, the facility has a rational layout that includes the kinds of office space, support space, and large public rooms needed for group home operation. With a recent switch in function between an office and bedroom, sight lines within the facility from the duty station are unobtrusive but very good. While the facility has its own full-service kitchen, most food is transported from the central kitchen at the main Ryther campus. There is a small outdoor recreation area on the site.

FACILITY SECURITY

Ryther has ordered an alarm system for exterior doors and windows and for interior bedroom doors. This system will give a coded alarm in the staff duty room that indicates which door or window has been opened. It has not been decided yet if motion detectors will be added around the perimeter of the building. Exterior lighting exists on all sides of the building.

Interior bedroom doors are being armed with alarms so that staff can tell when doors are opened at night. This feature is intended to make it easier to detect and prevent unauthorized nighttime visits between residents, presumably a bigger issue in a coed facility than in a single-sex facility.

The entire system is estimated to cost approximately \$3,500 installed. Some cottages at the main campus of the Ryther Child Center have already had similar alarm systems installed. The concept is patterned after the system used by Aloha House, a residential center operated by the YMCA in another part of Seattle.

The Safeco Safe House currently provides all transports of residents to work, school, or other community program or activity. Until relatively recently, some residents took public transportation. Some concern was expressed that driving the residents to all outside activities may defeat teaching of some important independent living skills.

STAFFING

The Safeco Safe House has a total of 11 full-time and four part-time employees. The program operates with three to four staff on duty during the day and evening shift and one awake staff during graveyard shift. Weekend staffing is the same as weekdays.

Full-time Safeco Safe House staff have, on average, worked at the facility for 1.8 years. They have worked with juvenile offenders for an average of 2.4 years. Part-time employees actually have longer average histories of working at the Safeco Safe House (2.0 years) and with juvenile offenders (3.0 years). High staff turnover has occurred (including the program supervisor) in recent months. According to the CRP Coordinator, staff turnover is one of the reasons why JRA has not referred many youth to the Safeco Safe House recently.

COMMUNITY RISK ASSESSMENT

Community risk assessments are conducted on JRA youth every 90 days. The CRP Coordinator does the assessments in consultation with the case manager, program manager, and cottage supervisor. Knowledge about behavior at school, work, and other off-site programs and activities is provided by periodic communication with teachers, employers and others, and by on-site spot checks by Ryther staff.

Community risk assessment forms in the case files of three recently discharged JRA youth were reviewed. (Historical files were used because no JRA youth were in residence at the time of the site visit.) While each file contained historical CRA forms, only one file contained a copy of a risk assessment conducted while the youth was in residence at the Safeco Safe House.

According to the CRP Coordinator, the original risk assessment form is filed in the youth's legal file at the regional office. The program is supposed to file a copy of the risk assessment form in the youth's on-site case file.

VIOLATIONS AND INFRACTIONS

Ryther, like other group home facilities we reviewed, keeps track of "incidents" rather than violations or infractions. While violations and infractions are a subset of incidents, incidents include a number of things besides failure to follow rules.

The Ryther Child Center "Quality Management Report" is used to report incidents. Incident types include the following: runaway, suicide attempt, destruction of property, use of time-out, theft, injury or medical emergency, assaultive behavior, medication irregularity, psychiatric emergency, ejection from school, self-abusive behavior, sexual acting out, child protective service issues (usually reports of abuse history), and "other." While this list includes incidents that are clearly violations or infractions, many incidents fall under some other heading. As a result, a count of incidents is not a count of infractions.

The Quality Management Reporting system used by Ryther allows statistical tracking of all incidents by time period and type. The information is computerized and copies of incident reports are kept in a chronologically organized three-ring binder.

Ryther reports 43 incident reports involving JRA youth during FY97. Three of these incidents resulted in the return of a JRA youth to an institution. While a few recent case files were examined, no attempt was made to find and review all case files of JRA youth who were at Ryther in FY97. The self report by Ryther of returns to JRA institutions conforms to information obtained by the WSIPP survey of new crimes and returns to institutions for FY97.

Rules for unacceptable behavior are clearly described in the Client Handbook given to all youth upon entry into Safeco Safe House. The program uses a level system with greater or lesser privileges and responsibilities depending on level. Failure to follow house rules can result in a change in level and loss of privileges. Unlike non-JRA youth, JRA youth can, of course, be transferred back to a JRA institution.

It was reported that housing JRA youth and non-JRA youth in the same program introduces challenges and frustrations in program operation. Youth in different programs are sometimes subject to different rules, limitations on activities, and consequences. Ryther reports that working with JRA youth is, in fact, generally much easier than working with non-JRA youth. There are at least two reasons for this. First, JRA youth are screened for referral to community programs such as Ryther's. While this is not true of the recovery program at the Safeco Safe House, non-JRA youth typically enter some of Ryther's residential programs after failing out of many others. The second reason why JRA youth are usually easier to work with is because they can be returned to a JRA institution if they don't follow the rules. It was stated that issues with compliance are generally much easier with JRA youth because of this.

Concern was expressed about mandatory returns to JRA institutions for youth in recovery on the first positive test for alcohol or drug use. Relapse is common in recovery programs, and relapse by juveniles is said to be more common than relapse by adults. Adults have more incentives to stay clean and sober. The loss of jobs, damage to relationships, and restrictions on access to one's own children are all issues that give added incentives to adults in recovery. These issues do not usually affect juveniles.

ESCAPES PROCEDURES

According to JRA data, two escapes occurred from the Safeco Safe House during FY 97 and none during the first ten months of FY 98.

An escape by a JRA youth from the Safe House is defined by Ryther as unauthorized absence of 20 minutes or longer. Ryther has a formal escape procedure which includes notification of the Seattle Police Department, JRA, parents, and Ryther administration.

VISITING

Visiting takes place on Saturdays and Sundays from 3 p.m. to 5 p.m. in the public spaces of the recovery house. This area is always under the direct supervision of the staff in the duty office. Additional visiting hours can be arranged if needed.

Visitors are limited to family members and sponsors/mentors. Family members under the age of 21 must be accompanied by an adult. Visitors are met by staff at the front door.

JRA MONITORING

JRA does formal reviews of the Safeco Safe House annually. The most recent review was completed in February 1998. While the program was found in substantial compliance with JRA standards, a case of consensual sexual contact between residents was reported in this review. Neither youth involved in the incident was a JRA resident. A formal investigation by the Division of Licensing Resources did not result in findings against Safeco Safe House staff; however, Ryther terminated the intern employee who was on duty during the time of the incident, reportedly because of other instances of poor judgment in supervising residents. JRA's interest in this matter relates to the fact that they believe they should have been informed even though the residents involved were not JRA clients.

The CRP Coordinator for the Safeco Safe House is also the CRP Coordinator for two other programs in the Seattle area. While none of these programs is large, each is very different from the others. This complicates the task of finding referrals and recruits for the CRPs. It also means that there are three different groups of staff to work with and three sets of staff meetings to attend. The CRP Coordinator stated that he generally is at a CRP two to five hours per week, depending upon how many JRA youth are in residence. Because there have been no JRA youth at the Safeco Safe House for some time, he hasn't been there. The program manager and on-site staff were unclear about who their CRP Coordinator actually was.

RELATIONS WITH THE COMMUNITY

The relations with the neighborhood are reported to be positive. The Safeco Safe House is an active member of the neighborhood block association and has hosted some block meetings at the recovery house.

There were no JRA residents in Safeco Safe House during the summer of 1998. Schools and employers were therefore not contacted.

According to the community service officer from the Seattle Police Department, this facility has not been a problem.

The neighbor immediately across the street is the block watch chairman for the area. He reports that the Safe House has been an active member of the block watch. He says that most of the time the facility is a very good neighbor but that, once in a while, "kids will be kids." He described one incident in which kids from the group home were laying down in the middle of the street despite the fact that cars sometimes go fast and can't see of the brow of a low rise just south of the group home.

The block watch chairman said that staff are "nice and cooperative." He said that if there was a problem that "we communicate well."

BEST PRACTICES

When Ryther was operating the Launch program for JRA youth at its main campus, every resident who went to school took a form with him or her that was completed by the teacher each day. In this way, the program received daily written reports on the youth's attendance, behavior, and participation in school activities. These forms supplemented periodic contact and site visits by case managers.

Ryther performs extensive background checks on all staff prior to hiring. They do criminal history checks with both the state patrol and FBI and background checks for child abuse and neglect through the CAMIS system. Ryther reports turning down new hires who have a history of working in other group homes but who fail the Ryther background check.

Ryther Child Center also sent staff from the (now closed) Launch program to Echo Glen Children's Center to observe operations for a day. Administrators believe that this training was valuable to their staff and also helped build credibility and support for Ryther programs. Knowledge about actual conditions and procedures at JRA facilities provides advantages to Ryther staff when working with JRA youth.

OTHER ISSUES

Concern about possible increased community participation in, or oversight of, Ryther operations was one of the factors that affected Ryther's decision to close the Launch program and cease its chemical dependency residential treatment program for JRA youth at its main campus. Reduced utilization rates brought about by decreased referrals from JRA and reimbursement rates that did not cover the full cost of providing services were also mentioned as other factors affecting this decision.

Ryther, like most well established non-profit service organizations, relies on its fine reputation in the community for much of its operating revenue and capital campaign contributions. Negative and potentially hostile reaction of neighbors, community members, and the legislature to the legal and personal profiles of some of the youth served by Ryther was considered too large a risk to the reputation of the agency. Mandatory community notification about certain types of sex offenders is also viewed as having a similar chilling effect.

These concerns overrode the obvious pride the organization had in the Launch program (which served sex offenders) and in the confidence administrators and program managers have in the staff and security procedures at Ryther. Their belief is that the staffing ratios during the day and evening and the 15-minute bed checks by awake staff throughout the night provide a much higher degree of safety than is provided by parents or others who monitor youthful offenders released directly from an institution to the community. While this is undoubtedly true, the potential liability to the agency—both in terms of reputation and otherwise—was judged to be too great to justify continuation of the program.

SECRET HARBOR SCHOOL CYPRUS ISLAND, WASHINGTON

FACILITY AND NEIGHBORHOOD DESCRIPTION

Secret Harbor School is a specialized residential treatment facility for mentally ill and behaviorally disordered boys. Approximately half of the residents are on medication. The program is licensed for 34 residents at its island facility. Secret Harbor also has three transitional beds in Anacortes and 15 foster care beds in Skagit County. The program takes DCFS, JRA, and private patients. JRA's contract allows them to place up to 13 juveniles at Secret Harbor. There is no guaranteed minimum. There were six JRA youth in residence on the day of the site visit. At any given time only a few private patients are in the program.

The school has a number of buildings on a large site on Cyprus Island. The two-story "main building" includes the kitchen, dining room, living room, office, laundry, storage, and various activity areas. A two-story housing wing is attached to the main building by covered walkways. Resident housing consists of 14 double occupancy rooms, seven rooms per floor. There is no internal circulation within the housing wings. All rooms, including shared bathrooms on each floor, exit to outdoor covered walkways. These two buildings, and a variety of staff quarters and outbuildings on the site, are all wood-frame construction. All these structures are generally showing their age. Secret Harbor intends to replace the housing wings with new construction.

The school building has four classrooms, a large computer lab, and a small gym. The school was rebuilt out of concrete block after the former school was destroyed by fire.

A new ancillary residential facility was recently opened at "the farm," several hundred yards away from the main complex. This cottage style residence was said to be similar to the replacement housing the program hopes to construct for the main campus. Live-in staff share common areas with six youth in a family-style environment.

The program was started 50 years ago as a summer camp for Ryther Child Center in Seattle. Sometime in the 1950s it evolved into its own program, largely serving private clients from other parts of the country. Over time the program began to accept more and more public placement clients.

The site is stunningly beautiful. Buildings are nestled in among the trees with views to the water. A large open pasture and garden area occupy a broad swale that stretches inland to the southwest. Most of the rest of the island is heavily wooded, steep terrain.

There are two nearby residences, neither of which is occupied full-time. A fine home and large parcel of land immediately adjacent to Secret Harbor School was for sale at the time of the site visit. Another 15 to 20 vacation cabins are located on the other side of the island.

FACILITY SECURITY

The facility does not have any institutional security features such as locks, alarms, or video cameras. Rather, the program relies on its island location and very high staff ratios for security.

Resident housing is actually difficult to supervise. The fact that staff have to go outdoors to get to each sleeping room is both inconvenient and inefficient. If there is a need for full-time supervision of the housing wings, a staff person is stationed on a dirt path overlooking the doors

to the 14 sleeping rooms. This presumably sometimes takes place in the cold, rain, and the dark. The difficulty of supervision, as well as the age and condition of the building, is an important factor in the program's desire to replace this building with better housing.

STAFFING

Secret Harbor School has 45 employees, almost all of whom work full-time. The average employee has worked at Secret Harbor for nearly five years. It is not known how long the average employee has worked with juvenile offenders. Since Secret Harbor has had juvenile offenders for many years, the average is presumably longer than five years. The director, for example, worked at Echo Glen Children's Center before coming to Secret Harbor.

Secret Harbor maintains very high staffing ratios. During normal business hours on weekdays, there are ten or more staff on duty for no more than 34 residents. On Saturdays, Sundays, and all evenings at least seven staff are on duty. Two awake staff are on duty at night. In addition, a number of staff live on the island in cabins provided by the school. These staff are always on call in case of need.

Whenever residents leave the island (for work or outings), there is always at least one staff for each four residents. It was reported that Secret Harbor residents in the community are never out of staff sight and sound supervision.

COMMUNITY RISK ASSESSMENT

The assistant executive director (who was not on duty at the time of the site visit) is the Secret Harbor staff person responsible for community risk assessments. He is said to complete risk assessments after conferring with the caseworkers and milieu manager. The assistant executive director also participates in weekly staffings on each resident. These occur every Thursday from 8:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. These meetings are run by the caseworkers and are attended by the consulting psychiatrist and others.

Secret Harbor runs its own school and does not use outside employers. Consequently, all input needed for risk assessments is available from Secret Harbor staff.

Case files for two JRA residents were reviewed in the Anacortes office of Secret Harbor. The risk assessments for both residents were current and on file.

VIOLATIONS AND INFRACTIONS

Secret Harbor maintains a log of incident reports for the current month in the duty office on the island. The logs for prior months are kept in the school's office in Anacortes. Incident reports are kept in case files in the Anacortes office. At the time of the site visit (the middle of August) there had so far been no incidents involving JRA youth during the current month.

Case files for two JRA residents were reviewed at the Anacortes office. There were three incident reports for one youth and none for the other. One incident involved horseplay. Another was a youth complaint alleging that another resident hit him. The third incident documented use of restraint by staff when the youth was not able to control himself.

According to survey data compiled by WSIPP, 23 JRA youth were admitted to Secret Harbor in FY 97. Of these, eight were returned to a JRA institution. Of the eight, one was returned following commission of a new misdemeanor crime.

Secret Harbor uses a level system to reward good behavior and discourage unacceptable behavior.

ESCAPE PROCEDURES

Secret Harbor defines escape as any circumstance when a resident is intentionally out of staff supervision with no intention of returning. As noted above, Secret Harbor maintains sight and sound supervision of residents at all times. Consequently, runaways should be detected quickly.

Secret Harbor escape reporting procedures include notification of JRA, the county sheriff, and island residents.

There was one reported escape from Secret Harbor by a JRA resident in FY 97 and two in FY 98. Each of these escapes occurred on Cyprus Island. None of the youths got off the island.

It should be noted that the program's island location does not preclude more serious escapes. There was one incident in the past (not involving JRA youth) where several residents ran off into the woods, broke into a vacation cabin and stole guns. The youths then abducted one of the counselors at gunpoint and forced him to take them in his boat. The boys were apprehended before they got to the mainland, but the incident was obviously extremely serious.

VISITING

Visiting is individually arranged. Residents may have visits by family and others approved by the program. Visitors are not constantly supervised by staff.

JRA MONITORING

JRA conducts annual reviews of Secret Harbor, the most recent of which (dated March 5, 1998) was exceptionally thorough. That review identified numerous areas where Secret Harbor policies and procedures and the Child Care Handbook were "seriously dated." The March 1998 review noted that "many of the findings and recommendations ... reflect the need to update and/or write policies and procedures that staff are currently practicing." Updated policies and procedures and a new Child Care Worker Resource Manual were in place at the time of the site visit in August.

The program director reports that the CRP Coordinator assigned to Secret Harbor comes to the Island about once a month and spends a day or half-day there each visit. He expressed disappointment over the level of involvement that the CRP Coordinator has with JRA residents. It is clear that at least some JRA youth would welcome more contact with the CRP Coordinator as well. During the site visit, one JRA resident wanted to know if I was "the JRA guy." When he was told that I was not, he was clearly disappointed.

It was also reported that there have been four CRP Coordinators assigned to Secret Harbor in the last two years. The director considers the CRP Coordinator to be "a very important resource" and would welcome a much stronger presence.

RELATIONS WITH THE COMMUNITY

Few full-time residents are on the island other than at Secret Harbor. There are 15 to 20 vacation cabins on the west side and two estates on the east. Eighty-seven percent of the island is owned by the Department of Natural Resources, which is trying to acquire much of the island for a nature preserve.

Schools and Employers

Secret Harbor runs its own school on the Island. In an unusual arrangement, the Anacortes School District counts the students at Secret Harbor School in its enrollment but passes through state school funding to Secret Harbor. The school teachers on the island are Secret Harbor School employees, rather than Anacortes School District employees.

Secret Harbor also runs all its own work programs. Small numbers of youth accompany work supervisors to the mainland to perform park and lands maintenance projects. A minimum ratio of one supervisor per four youth is always maintained.

Law Enforcement

Skagit County Sheriff Ed Goodman described the working relationship between Secret Harbor School and law enforcement as very positive. Citing open-ended offers of help (e.g. with transportation to the island), he said that the director of the school was “nothing but cooperative.” The sheriff also mentioned that with the advent of cellular telephone coverage to Cyprus Island, communications have greatly improved. (Cyprus Island has no other telephone service.)

Sheriff Goodman also said that, “While the people out at Strawberry Bay [see below] would probably tar and feather me for it, I like the location.” As he noted, if they weren’t there, they’d be on the mainland.

Island Residents

Opinions of island residents/homeowners about Secret Harbor School are mixed. The closest neighbor is an enthusiastic supporter of the school and is reported by the school director to have donated fairly substantial sums of money to the school over the years. This neighbor said that, while he wouldn’t necessarily pick the school as a neighbor, “I’m in favor of the facility.” His positive assessment occurs despite his casual observation that kids from the school have sometimes broken into his home, broken windows, or “borrowed” the jeep or the skiff.

One full-time resident whose family has been on the island for many years said that he has “always had good relations” with Secret Harbor. He noted that he lives fairly distant from the school and doesn’t see any of the kids on his part of the island very often. With regard to staff and administration at the school his assessment is “They’ve been great.”

Residents at Strawberry Bay have a different opinion. Strawberry Bay is a small community made up mainly of vacation homes. The fact that the community is isolated and cannot rely on rapid law enforcement response makes many of the residents feel threatened. Past experience gives them reason to be worried.

In 1978, a group of homeowners on Cyprus Island (mainly owners of vacation homes at Strawberry Bay) brought suit against Secret Harbor as a public nuisance. According to the

current director, the staffing ratios in the 1970s were much lower than they are today, and a number of instances occurred where Secret Harbor youths broke into, or vandalized, homes at Strawberry Bay. While some homeowners apparently believe that there was a court order requiring the school to maintain better control over the students or else be shut down, a written order was never issued. Both sides submitted written suggestions, but the judge died after issuing only a verbal order. The case was dismissed in October 1986.

While it appears that control of the kids at Secret Harbor School has improved and that relations between the school and the Strawberry Bay community are far less contentious than in former years, the president of the homeowners association said that there are still 10 to 12 runners per year and that four or five of them reach Strawberry Bay looking for boats, food, or alcohol. (Given the number of juvenile offenders at Secret Harbor, it is likely that only a few of these runners have been JRA youth.) Over the years, theft and property damage have occurred. In one instance, guns were stolen. According to the association president, the school has always compensated people for damaged property, although "not always to people's satisfaction." The association president also noted that the current director at Secret Harbor School has been "very receptive" to concerns of the Strawberry Bay community.

Another board member from the community association has been working with Secret Harbor School to improve communications and escape procedures. The school provided the single full-time resident at Strawberry Bay with a cell phone so that quick notification could occur. In addition, when it is discovered that someone has escaped, a staff person is supposed to go immediately to Strawberry Bay to watch over the community. While the community likes this procedure, there was a situation early in 1998 when several kids ran while on an outing on the island. The staff person in charge first returned to the school with the remaining kids before anyone was sent to Strawberry Bay. In the meantime, the two kids who ran had broken into three cabins.

The board member in charge of working with Secret Harbor School said that Strawberry Bay residents would like to have pager notification to all residents in the event of an escape.

BEST PRACTICES

The practice of constant sight and sound monitoring of residents with very good staff to resident ratios provides a level of supervision not seen in any other program we visited. While this practice is certainly expensive (and probably not appropriate for all juvenile offenders in residential settings), it provides an opportunity for higher-risk and more difficult-to-manage juveniles to transition from institutions to the community.

OTHER ISSUES

The Secret Harbor School program is very expensive because of the nature of the specialized treatment it provides and because it is on an island.

Reimbursement rates at Secret Harbor are very high. Private placement patients pay \$5,250 per month. In contrast, the highest rate charged to JRA is \$900 less. JRA's rates are also much lower than those paid by DCFS. The highest monthly DCFS rate is \$2,100 more than the highest JRA rate. Even the lowest monthly DCFS rate is \$500 more than the highest JRA rate.

The costs associated with living on an island are considerable. In addition to the normal complement of buildings needed for such a program, the school has dock facilities on the island

and in Anacortes. It runs its own water taxi between the school and Anacortes to transport employees, residents, visitors, and supplies. The school has its own water system, sewage disposal, and roads. It even generates its own electricity. Because there is no fire department, insurance costs are very high.

Largely because of the fire hazard, Secret Harbor is said by the director to be the only facility in the state that may refuse to take DCFS referrals. The director reports that there have been two major fires at the facility in its 50-year history. Both fires were started by residents. He keeps a picture in his drawer of the most recent fire that completely destroyed the school building.

Exemption from DCFS's no-decline policy did not come easily to Secret Harbor. When the no-decline contract was offered by DCFS in 1994, Secret Harbor elected not to participate. The census was so low at the school for the next two years that the program was forced to sell land to cover costs.

SELMA R. CARSON HOME FIFE, WASHINGTON

FACILITY AND NEIGHBORHOOD DESCRIPTION

The Selma R. Carson Home was opened as a community residential facility for JRA male adolescents in October 1995. The program is licensed for 23 beds and is operated by Pioneer Human Services.

JRA contracts with the Carson Home for 23 beds, 11 of which are guaranteed. The program has had an average census of about 15 JRA youth over the last six months. There were 16 youth in residence on the day of the site visit, with two more scheduled for arrival later in the day. It was reported that the break-even point for Carson Home is about 18 residents.

The facility is on a large, flat site set back from a busy commercial street. The property borders on the Indian reservation. The immediate neighborhood is primarily industrial and commercial. It was reported that many nearby employers hire JRA youth. There are a few single family residences in the area, mainly on the opposite side of the street.

The building is a single-story, concrete block structure originally built as a nursing home and has 21 bedrooms, 20 of which are used as sleeping rooms. (One has been converted to a classroom.) Almost all rooms are single occupancy. Support spaces include a kitchen, laundry, large multi-purpose room, offices, classroom, small weight room, and visiting alcove.

FACILITY SECURITY

Physical security features at the Carson Home are limited. There are no door alarms, window screens, video camera, or similar features. The outside is well illuminated at night and the building is laid out in a simple, straightforward manner that makes it easy to supervise. Hallway mirrors opposite the duty station allow staff to monitor all interior and exterior doors at a glance. Exterior doors are locked so that people cannot get in without assistance.

During the first 30 days of residence in Carson Home, youth are on restricted status, and all transports outside the facility (if any) are provided by staff. The program uses a level system with greater freedom of movement permitted at higher levels. Youth at Level 1 or above may use public transportation on certain bus routes. (Certain downtown Tacoma areas are off limits due to drug trafficking.)

STAFFING

The facility operates with four to five staff on duty during the day shift Monday through Friday, and three staff on duty during the day on weekends. The evening shift has three to four staff on duty. Nights are covered by two staff.

The program recently modified its staffing patterns to maintain the amount of time available for case management activities while using fewer case managers: there are now two case managers instead of five. Case managers now do less floor management and more case management and counseling. At the same time, floor management staff has been increased.

The average employee at Carson Home has worked 3.4 years with juvenile offenders. The director and clinical director have worked 8.5 and 10 years with juveniles, respectively.

Because the program is new, no employees have worked at this location for more than 2.5 years.

COMMUNITY RISK ASSESSMENT

It was reported that a team approach has always been used at Carson Home for completion of the community risk assessment. The team includes the CRP Coordinator, the Clinical Director, the Case Manager, and the resident. In addition, the Clinical Director completes a more detailed evaluation of each resident using the Level of Service Inventory (LSI). Like the community risk assessment, this evaluation is also done on a 90-day cycle. It was reported that the LSI is used as input for the CRA assessment.

The LSI is conducted on all incoming residents just after arrival. It was reported by the Clinical Director that Carson Home has returned referrals to JRA who scored below 20 on the community risk assessment because the LSI indicated they were too great a risk relative to the program's own standards.

Community risk assessments for two juveniles were reviewed by examining their case files. One youth had been in residence for more than a year but had only one CRA form (the most recent) in his case file. A full set of LSI forms was in his file. The other youth had been in residence for seven months. His file included all expected CRA and LSI forms.

According to the CRP Coordinator, the original risk assessment form is kept in the legal file in the JRA regional office. A copy of the CRA form is given to the Carson Home. Carson Home is responsible for maintaining on-site case files.

VIOLATIONS AND INFRACTIONS

The Carson Home has a one page list of behaviors and consequences that is provided to all incoming residents. Unacceptable behaviors are: failure to stay within boundaries, fighting, horseplay, inappropriate language, missed bus, not following staff direction, not signing in or out, refusing to program, positive UA, smoking, theft, failure to have room checked off, excessive noise or music, not getting up on time, and failure to complete in-house work detail. Consequences range from a warning to referral to JRA and law enforcement. Other consequences include: loss of activity or other privilege, additional work or writing assignments, early bed or early wake-up, 24- or 48-hour in-house detention, level review, drop in level, or placement on level zero.

Incident reports are written on infractions and other significant events. Carson Home began logging incident reports in July 1997. Copies of incident reports are kept in individual case files and in a master file. The master file for FY97 was reviewed and incidents were categorized by type. Note that some incidents are not infractions. The results of this analysis are summarized in the following table.

It was reported that these incidents resulted in 25 cases where a resident was dropped in level. Other behavior that does not warrant an incident report can also result in a drop in level.

INCIDENT REPORTS DURING FY97

Description	Number
Escape	11
Unaccounted time/late return	12
Drugs/alcohol/tamper with UA	3
Crime reported to police (sexual harassment at school)	1
Fighting	3
Threats and verbal abuse	6
Theft/missing property	3
Smoking	4
Other (out of bounds, pornography, property damage)	4
Subtotal	47
Not an infraction	19
Total	66

Two residents were interviewed at Carson Home. Both were aware of the rules, expectations, and consequences for unacceptable behavior. Both were aware of the Youth Complaint Form.

ESCAPE PROCEDURES

The Carson Home defines an escape as any circumstance when the program is unable to locate the resident and in which the resident does not meet the criteria for an "unauthorized leave." An unauthorized leave occurs when a resident returns to the facility or approved activity within two hours. Escape procedures are initiated immediately upon learning that the resident is not accounted for. If he returns within two hours, the escape procedures are terminated and the incident is handled as an unauthorized leave.

According to both Carson Home incident reports and JRA data, 11 escapes from the Carson Home occurred in FY97. In contrast, there were two in FY98 and none (as of November) during calendar year 1998.

VISITING

Visiting takes place on Saturdays and Sundays in the "social area" next to the duty station or outside in front of the building. There is also a small alcove off the corridor near the social area where small, single-family visits can take place. Staff in the duty office have an excellent view of the social area. Visual monitoring of outdoor visiting, or visiting in the alcove off the corridor, can only be observed from outside the duty office.

The Carson Home uses a level system that affects the number and type of visits a resident may have. When a juvenile first arrives, he may have visits only from immediate family members. As he progresses up the level system, he may have visits from extended family members, girlfriend, pastor, and other friends.

Visitors are screened by the resident's case manager. Visits are not allowed by anyone on parole or probation or by anyone who has a JRA record.

JRA MONITORING

JRA conducts formal reviews of the Carson Home annually. The last formal review took place in June 1998. Items in the June 1998 review that required corrective action were minor. All formal reviews take place during normal business hours. There have been no unannounced reviews.

The JRA Coordinator for the Carson Home spends most of each weekday morning at the facility. Staff report that the CRP Coordinator is on-site about 15 hours per week. There have been no CRP Coordinator site visits outside of normal business hours.

It was reported that queries to the JRA Officer of the Day are generally, but not always, answered promptly.

It was also reported that getting information from JRA institutions—particularly information about specialized treatment needs or program participation—is very difficult. While the situation “appears to be getting better,” even when information is provided, the quality of the information was said to be inconsistent.

RELATIONS WITH THE COMMUNITY

The Carson Home has very few residential neighbors. It considers its “neighbors” to be the community at large plus its primary constituencies: law enforcement, the local high school, and employers.

Using this definition, Carson Home management believes that relations with the community are very good, but that it has taken a lot of hard work to achieve the positive relations it currently enjoys. In particular, the program reports excellent relations with the Fife Police Department, the Fife High School, and with employers who hire Carson Home youth. The high school calls Carson Home when their residents are tardy. Rather than having neighbors call the police to complain about the group home, the police have called Carson Home to make sure that problem neighbors are not bothering the group home. It was reported that the program enjoys the support of “influential people” in the community.

Schools

Residents of Carson Home who haven't finished high school or obtained a GED attend the Fife High School or an Alternative High School.

No Carson Home residents were registered in the regular high school in the fall of 1998; however, several have attended in previous years. A counselor at the high school described their experience as positive. She said that one student who graduated last year was “one of our favorite kids.” He was a track star and was elected sweetheart of the senior class. She said that the school is small enough that they know right away if a kid is missing from class. (Attendance is reported by computer from each classroom.) She said that, while there haven't been many problems, the Carson Home staff was very good to work with. The counselor reported that Carson Home staff sometimes stop by to check on their kids and she even knows some staff by name.

Justice Agency Representatives

The Carson Home is under the jurisdiction of the Fife Police Department. According to the sergeant to whom we were referred, calls for service at Carson Home have been few. He contrasted this with the previous group home tenant at the same address and said, "Any facility we have with as many kids has many more calls for service." He was especially complimentary of the current director and said, "This company is very good."

The sergeant noted that Carson Home residents are also "big volunteers," and was pleased by the amount of community service provided by the residents.

The Fife Police Department's standard response to calls for service at the facility is a two-officer response (the same as is used for domestic cases). In the sergeant's experience, the worst situations at Carson Home have involved possible drugs. He recalled one situation in which the county drug dogs were called in and a resident was found to have residue in his room. The resident was sent back to a JRA institution.

The Pierce County Juvenile Court and Juvenile Probation do not have responsibility over juvenile offenders in the Carson Home.

Employers

Carson Home residents work at fast food operations in the Fife area, at Pioneer Human Services industries in Seattle, and at a large window manufacturer located near the facility.

The manager of a local Burger King said that they have hired six to eight Carson Home residents over the last few years and that they have generally done very well. He said that staff at the home call and stop by to check on their kids working there. He expects to continue to hire Carson Home youth and would recommend them to other employers.

The manager at Milgard Windows was not happy with the performance of the three Carson Home residents they hired. All three quit for reasons unknown to him, and he does not intend to hire any more. Based on his experience, he would not recommend Carson Home residents to other employers.

A new manager at a Skipper's Restaurant said that they have had one Carson Home resident working for them for the four months she has been there. She described it as her first experience with group home workers. She was very positive and would recommend Carson Home residents to other employers. She was particularly pleased with how flexible the resident is in working hours ("an important thing in the restaurant business") and how reliable he is.

The manager at a local Arby's was also positive in his assessment of Carson Home workers. He has had Carson Home residents working for him for the past year. Prior to that, he hired residents from a work release facility when he managed another restaurant. He has recommended group home hires to other employers. He said that staff from the group home "just pop in to the front counter and ask if so-and-so is there. He steps out, and they see him. It's easy, it isn't a hassle."

Neighbors

The Carson Home has few residential neighbors. Most of the neighborhood is commercial or light industrial. Surveys were sent to the four residential addresses within a couple blocks from the facility that looked like they might be occupied. None were returned.

BEST PRACTICES

The Carson Home uses the Level of Service Inventory (LSI) as part of the risk assessment, program planning, and evaluation of individual residents. Targeted improvements in LSI scores are also used as outcome measures to evaluate the effectiveness of the overall program and the treatment offered by Carson Home. The LSI is also used as a check on the Community Risk Assessment. Carson Home has sent referrals back to JRA when their LSI score showed a higher risk than implied by their CRA score.

The Level of Service Inventory (LSI) is generally considered to be the best instrument for predicting future recidivism that is currently available. While many of the factors measured by the LSI are static (i.e., they cannot be changed no matter what the offender does), others are dynamic (i.e., they can change as the offender changes). These dynamic predictor variables (employment status, criminal associates, etc.) become targets for intervention. By developing experience and building skills in these areas, the risk of future recidivism can be reduced. The Carson Home's target is a two point reduction in LSI score in the first 90 days a youth is in residence. A two point reduction is relatively easy. For example, none of the JRA youth have a job when they arrive. Getting a job will reduce their LSI score by two points. Other common issues shared by many JRA referrals are drug and alcohol problems, peer issues, and transitional problems. While much more can certainly be done, this approach is very promising.

Many of the residents at Carson Home are integrated into other parts of the Pioneer Human Services system. About half of all residents are in a Pioneer Industries work or training program. Some residents, upon leaving Carson Home for return to the community, move into Pioneer housing. These low income, subsidized apartments are generally drug and alcohol free living situations that support ongoing efforts for residents to stay clean and sober. This vertical integration of structured post-institution housing, work, and semi-supported independent living in the community can provide the kind of seamless continuity in treatment, values, and positive role models that is more often talked about as a goal than accomplished in fact.

OTHER ISSUES

Even though all CRPs in the state are operated by non-profit organizations, these programs are still businesses that must make payrolls and pay bills. Given this economic reality, the relationship between facility fill rates, program financial performance, and risk management decisions is important.

At some point, if average daily populations fall too low for too long, programs will lose money. When this happens, there may be temptations to take referrals or tolerate behavior that under other circumstances would not be acceptable. The question was posed to the program administrators, do economic considerations color program decisions? Can economic imperatives cause decreased community safety?

It was acknowledged that these issues have been discussed within the Pioneer Human Services organization. The program does lose money when fewer than 18 youth are in residence. The average daily population at Carson Home has been below this level for many

months during FY98. The program manager was clear, however, that the parent organization has put no pressure on the Carson Home, but rather, has emphasized the importance of not having financial considerations influence professional judgment. In the words of the program manager, "Do I want to keep the numbers up? Sure. But I don't want to have an incident even more."

It was reported that discussions in staff meetings have explicitly acknowledged the tension between certain program decisions and the facility's fill rate/financial performance. However, these discussions are said to take the form of trying to ensure that decisions are *not* affected by financial considerations. In other words, there is a conscious effort to bend over backwards to avoid having financial considerations jeopardize public safety. The CRP Coordinator confirmed that these types of discussions take place. While he was clear that he has received no direct pressure by the program to keep beds full, he feels that this is his responsibility.

This candid discussion reveals that this is indeed a real issue. An organization with less financial resources might well be faced with the choice of taking higher risks or going out of business. This is not a choice that should be forced on program managers.

SUNRISE GROUP HOME EPHRATA, WASHINGTON

FACILITY AND NEIGHBORHOOD DESCRIPTION

Sunrise Group Home is a 16-bed male facility operated by JRA. It emphasizes vocational training and preparation for independent living. Like many facilities for this population, it also offers opportunities to prevent relapse into chemical dependency.

Average lengths of stay are comparatively short, despite the fact they report the second longest stay in a JRA group home. Residents must have at least six to seven months to serve. A few youth stay more than a year. Those who do not meet staff expectations are quickly returned to the institutions. Despite other community program experience with decreasing referrals in the last year, Sunrise staff report that they have a list of youth waiting to enter their facility. A staff person tours the institutions, looking for promising referrals.

This facility was built in 1968 for its current purpose as a JRA facility. In 1968 that meant the facility held dependent and delinquent youth. Group home parents provided supervision, and the facility had an apartment for the group home parents. The apartment is now used as an independent living unit for one resident.

Sunrise, Canyon View, and Parke Creek have very similar floor plans. The boys sleep in seven rooms off a corridor. Rooms are multiple occupancy. Most have two occupants. There are actually beds for 18, but Sunrise is only budgeted for 16 residents.

A staff duty station (called a “kiosk” at Parke Creek) looks down the corridor and out into the living room and dining areas. Unlike Canyon View, Sunrise has no schoolroom. The area at the end of the kitchen and dining area is used for recreation. It has a pool table and television. Other modifications make the three facilities appear quite different.

Sunrise is on the far east side of town, about a mile from Ephrata’s main intersection. A residential neighborhood to the west is a fairly recent development and includes some very nice houses. The neighbor immediately to the west is a church. On the other three sides are open fields. The airport is about a half-mile to the southeast.

FACILITY SECURITY

The building is a one-story, wood frame building, which could give the appearance of a residence at first glance. Unlike Canyon View, it isn’t just the number of cars in the parking lot and its size that make it obvious this is not a regular residence, but also the camera on a pole off the driveway and the apparent lack of a family’s possessions in the yard.

Residents can exit the building in case of fire but are otherwise restricted unless staff are nearby. The doors are alarmed and quite loud. When residents are working in the yard or playing basketball, the alarm on the door is deactivated.

The hallway in the sleeping area has a motion detector so that the staff person on duty hears a buzz if a youth leaves his room at night. The windows in the area frequented by the residents are solid glass and do not open. The windows in the sleeping rooms also cannot be opened.

The exterior of the building is lit at night. The site is not fenced.

In the past, they had a problem with a father dropping alcohol in the yard for later pickup by the residents. They now have cameras on the back and front of the building. The monitor is in the staff office, but this is not always manned, including at night.

The Job Corps, where residents go for academic and vocational instruction, was not included in the original plans for the site visit. However, I did drive by. It is located on the west side of Moses Lake near the airport and several blocks off Highway 17. The neighborhood is a combination of industry, low-income housing, and the community college. The campus has several disconnected buildings. Sunrise staff report that the buildings include dormitories (off limits for Sunrise residents), classrooms, vocational training rooms, a dining room, and recreational areas. Approximately 200 men and women are in the Moses Lake Job Corps program.

STAFFING

Six staff positions rotate through each day's shifts. Eight staff cover the six positions, not including the facility administrator. This is a mature staff as the average age is 45, and most have worked at Sunrise for a long time. The average tenure (not counting the administrator who just arrived this year) is almost 15 years. Four have been there over 20 years.

Starting on a weekday morning, two staff are on duty; this includes the staff permanently assigned to the Job Corps site. The second staff person is a resident counselor who rotates into that job from swing shift one day a week. He or she uses that time to make collateral contacts and to do paperwork. One of these two is there early enough to cover the 7:15 a.m. departure to the Job Corps. The facility administrator is usually there as well.

On a normal day, such as the day of the site visit, all youth are at the Job Corps or in transit from 7:15 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Job Corps staff take attendance, report residents when they fail to appear, and record the location of Sunrise residents hourly. They even monitor Sunrise youth who are at the site after normal training hours. Since most escapes from the Job Corps location have occurred when youths move from the classroom to the dining room and back to the classroom, another staff person is added to provide extra supervision during the lunch hour.

No later than 4 p.m., three staff are on duty at the group home. Dinner occurs soon after the residents return from Job Corps. After dinner, staff are busy working with youth directly or taking them to activities. The youth spend their evenings taking classes on criminal thinking and drug alcohol education. Each weekday night, several youth attend AA or NA. Friday there is often a movie at the theater or skating. They are in their rooms by 9:30 p.m. on the nights before they go to Job Corps.

Weekend staff are staggered throughout the day: two work days, another works 1 p.m. to 9 p.m., two work from dinnertime until midnight or 1 a.m., and one works midnight to 8 a.m. Weekend activities include facility clean-up, community service (highway litter pick-up), visitation, and recreation such as swimming, skating, bowling, or dancing at the Job Corps. Sunday evening there is another AA meeting.

By midnight or 1 a.m. only one staff person is on duty until 7 or 8 a.m. Staff on the graveyard shift wear panic buttons so they can call for help. During the day other staff are around: the cook, the secretary, and occasionally the maintenance man.

Staff drive youth wherever they need to go. Before the new restrictions, youth were permitted to walk to the store, into the park in town, or to weekend odd jobs.

COMMUNITY RISK ASSESSMENT

The counselor and the supervisor complete the community risk assessments. When they have reached their conclusions, they bring the youth in and discuss how he has been doing. The youth then signs the final assessment. The staff think the risk assessment tool is vague and does not discriminate well. A check of records showed that CRAs are routine, timely, and in order.

Job Corps staff provide regular progress and attendance reports. Sunrise counselors do an assessment on each youth every two weeks. This assessment includes staff relationships, peer relationships, Job Corps trade, Job Corps school, Job Corps behavior, aftercare attendance, class participation, appropriate dress, room/detail grades, attitude, timeliness, counseling progress, and community service. Each counselor contributes. The results include scores and comments, and the outcome affects levels. This information adds to their judgments when the CRA is completed.

During my discussion with staff and in the written bi-weekly assessments, staff frequently praised individual youth and applauded their achievements.

VIOLATIONS AND INFRACTIONS

Sunrise uses a level system. Youth progress based on behavior with some limitations due to time in the program.

Each level has its own requirements: attendance at AA meetings, attendance at treatment groups, no write-ups from Job Corps, getting along with peers, following staff directions, remaining alcohol/drug-free, acting in pro-social ways.

Infractions are separate from the level requirements, although some infractions parallel the level requirements. For example, a youth on the second level must have no dirty UAs or BAs. Using drugs or alcohol is an infraction and results in restrictions.

There were no residents present during the site visit. Due to a delay in one youth returning to the Job Corps from his job, all residents were still there at 4:45. As a result no residents were interviewed.

The incident log is the record for all minor incidents. The record was consistent with the infractions and penalties in the restriction levels. Critical incident reports are kept in the youth's file.

ESCAPE PROCEDURES

Escape is defined as an attempt to leave the area with no intention of returning. Staff begin to look immediately but wait an hour to notify authorities. This is true at the group home and at the Job Corps. During other off-site activities, staff now keep the youth in view at all times. The exception is AA/NA meetings where staff may wait in the foyer.

The last escape at Sunrise Group Home was nine months ago. Escapes were occurring at the Job Corps while the youth were at lunch or seeing the nurse, i.e., not under the supervision of a Job Corps teacher or the Sunrise staff on-site. This trend led to Sunrise staff presence during the lunch hour. Another escape occurred when two youth decided to go to a party. There has not been a nighttime escape for 15 years.

VISITING

Visitation is Friday evening and Saturday and Sunday afternoons. Visitors are family and friends. All visits are pre-approved by the counselor. Visits are not always supervised but are restricted to public areas of the building. Youths are permitted off-site visits with family.

JRA MONITORING

JRA did a formal performance review in April 1998. Audits take place about every three to four years. The last unannounced visit from JRA staff was perhaps ten years ago. They have had a review at night.

RELATIONS WITH THE COMMUNITY

Ephrata is a small town. Most of the staff have been at Sunrise a long time, and the previous administrator was there for many years. They have good relationships with local residents who they say are quite supportive of the facility.

The youth themselves used to interact with community members more. They walked back and forth to town, went to the store, and worked in neighbors' yards. Restrictions on unescorted community time have reduced this considerably.

Several members of the community have taken a personal interest in the facility. One merchant "always has one or two boys under her wing." The theater owner gives them a deal on movie tickets.

Schools

Since 1989, residents of Sunrise have attended school at the Job Corps in Moses Lake. Job Corps staff speak positively of their relationship with Sunrise staff and residents. During these years, about 250 Sunrise residents have been in the Job Corps program and approximately 15 have been sent back to Sunrise because of behavior problems. The Sunrise staff are responsive to Job Corps issues, and staff in both agencies work together on a regular basis and with the residents. A Sunrise staff person is on-site, so there is no problem about whom to call.

Employers

The Job Corps is also the employer of all but the occasional, exceptional Sunrise resident. At the time of the site visit, one resident had been at Sunrise long enough that he had graduated from Job Corps and was just beginning his first job.

Justice Agency Representatives

Sunrise is under the jurisdiction of the Ephrata Police Chief. According to Detective Glenn Maryott, JRA sends the department a sheet notifying them whenever Sunrise has a new resident. They have not had many problems with these youth. There is the occasional escape

or someone who violates the rules of the facility, and once or twice there has been an assault in the facility. According to the detective, the residents are well supervised.

The Juvenile Court has a contract with Sunrise Group Home to hold county residents prior to their transfer back to a JRA institution. The court also has a contract to provide parole services. He is concerned about the impact on his court of the loss of parole services. Where they used to supervise 35 youth, they now supervise two.

Neighbors

One of the neighbors is a church. The minister has known the facility and its staff since the church was built in 1985. He was initially concerned about potential trouble with having the facility close by, but none has materialized. His relations with the residents and staff are positive, and he would know whom to contact if there were a problem.

A written survey was sent to ten neighbors, and five were returned. Four of the respondents rated the facility an "excellent neighbor." The fifth respondent rated it a "good neighbor."

One respondent said there had been a problem with runaways in the past, but that there are fewer now. Another said the facility used to "attract the wayward girls of the community until the home's policy changed about allowing the boys to frequent the park down the street."

Several people had very positive comments. One said, "Overall, it's been a very positive addition to our community." Alluding to new restrictions on permissible activity, another said, "I miss the boys being able to come out and help with yard work. They were always polite and helpful and did a very good job."

TOUCHSTONE GROUP HOME OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON

FACILITY AND NEIGHBORHOOD DESCRIPTION

Touchstone Group Home is a 16-bed residential facility for male juvenile offenders located in Olympia, Washington. Touchstone is operated by Second Chance. The program only takes JRA referrals, and JRA guarantees eight of the 16 beds. Thirteen youth were in residence on the day of the site visit.

Two wood-frame buildings are on the site. The main building has a kitchen, dining room, multi-purpose room, office, and duty station on the ground floor. There are eight bedrooms and a small office upstairs. All but one of the bedrooms are double occupancy. According to the program director, two of the bedrooms are large enough to permit a third occupant. One smaller room is used as an "honor room" for a single occupant.

A second, single story building on the site is used as an office for the director and as an indoor exercise area. The CRP Coordinator also has a desk in this building. There is a small paved area with a basketball court in the back yard. The buildings and grounds appear to be in excellent condition.

Touchstone is located in a suburban neighborhood on the north side of Olympia. There is a church on the property immediately to the east, and the remainder of the neighborhood is either well-maintained, single family residences or wooded vacant land.

FACILITY SECURITY

All bedrooms are equipped with window alarms and have fly screens caulked in place. Unlike most of the residential facilities we saw that have screens on the windows, the screens at Touchstone were in excellent condition and appeared not to have been tampered with. There are no door alarms or video cameras. All sides of the building have outdoor lighting. The program director said he would like to have a continuously recording video camera to monitor the outdoor recreation area.

On the night shift, one employee sits in a chair in the upstairs hallway where the residents' bedrooms are located. During the day, staff in the duty office have an excellent view of all of the public spaces on the ground floor. Residents are not permitted upstairs without staff supervision during the day.

Touchstone was using school and employer responsibility agreements before they were required of all facilities by JRA. It was reported that JRA modeled its employer agreements on the Touchstone form after it tightened policies in the fall of 1997.

Because of long standing relations with Tumwater High School, Touchstone residents continued to attend Tumwater High despite having moved into the Olympia School District in early 1997. The program employs a college student to work as a school monitor. The school monitor is at the high school for two to three hours every day. Tumwater High School teachers have visited Touchstone.

The program conducts numerous community accountability checks and reports that they completed 1,037 in the first seven months of 1997. This computes to an average of nearly

seven checks every workday. Since the program's census has been low, this means that virtually every youth is being checked an average of approximately once per day. Furthermore, it was reported that most of these checks are visual (rather than by telephone). Everyone, including the program director and CRP Coordinator, is said to make community accountability checks. This level of community accountability checking greatly exceeds the minimum requirements specified by JRA.

Touchstone does not give community home passes to residents. A staff person accompanies the resident if he makes a home visit.

STAFFING

Touchstone has ten full-time employees and four part-time employees. The average full-time employee has worked 3.5 years at Touchstone and 4.2 years with juvenile offenders. Part-time employees have worked at Touchstone an average of 2.5 years.

According to Touchstone's self-assessment, two staff are on duty every day and every shift who have direct responsibility for supervising residents. On weekdays four additional staff are usually on duty (director, administrative assistant, cook, and often the CRP Coordinator). One additional employee is on duty on weekend days.

COMMUNITY RISK ASSESSMENT

Touchstone recently changed the procedure for doing community risk assessments to involve more staff in scoring decisions. In the past, the CRP Coordinator completed the risk assessment on his own while conferring with the resident. Now, the case manager and CRP Coordinator complete the risk assessment with input from the counselors. The risk assessment is reviewed with the resident following its completion. The program manager stated that he would like to add this function to regular staff meetings.

The program receives quarterly written reports from all employers. In addition, since the program provides all transports, staff talk with employers every day. As noted above, the program employs a school monitor who provides information on resident behavior at school on a more or less constant basis. All-in-all, the quantity of information available for making risk assessment decisions is excellent.

Case files of two residents were reviewed. All risk assessments were on file, up to date, and completed on schedule. One older risk assessment form that was scored at a JRA institution was observed to be in obvious error. For one youth, the offense seriousness score (which should remain fixed) changed from one assessment to another.

VIOLATIONS AND INFRACTIONS

Touchstone uses its own form for recording incidents. A copy of the incident report is kept in the resident's case file and in a master file. As with other programs, incident reports at Touchstone cover matters that are not violations or infractions as well as matters that are related to breaking rules. The forms have no standard system for coding the type of incident, rather they use a narrative description. As a result, all incident reports must be read in order to categorize them. Incident reports covering the period from July 1, 1997 to June 30, 1998, were reviewed. (Incident reports for FY 97 were not available.) The following table summarizes the type and number of reported incidents.

INCIDENT REPORTS – July 1, 1997 to June 30, 1998

TYPE OF INCIDENT	NUMBER
Assault	3
Fighting (one at school)	4
Positive UA	5
Out of school area	2
Out of work area	1
Out of bounds or out of room at residence	2
In bedroom other than own	4
Unauthorized phone call	1
Unaccounted for time	1
Threaten staff	1
Pornography (one incident, four residents)	4
Property damage	1
Other (smoking, arguing, horseplay, etc.)	46
	75
Not an infraction (mainly medical)	15
Total incident reports	90

Like most community residential facilities, Touchstone uses a level system to encourage good behavior and sanction unacceptable behavior.

According to survey data collected by the WSIPP, 25 JRA youth were admitted to Touchstone in FY 97. Of these, five were returned to a JRA institution. None of these readmissions was for commission of a new crime.

ESCAPE PROCEDURES

Touchstone defines an escape as any circumstance where a resident leaves the facility or approved site with no intention of returning. Escape notification procedures specify that JRA, law enforcement (state patrol, local police, and police in the resident's home town), and family be notified.

According to JRA data, one escape occurred from Touchstone in FY97 and another in FY98.

VISITING

Visiting takes place in the public areas of the building and grounds on Saturday and Sunday afternoons. Immediate family may also visit from 7 p.m. to 9 p.m. on Wednesdays. Residents on the highest two levels in the level system may have visitors on Saturday evenings between 7 p.m. and 9 p.m. Visitors must have the approval of the youth's counselor and family before making their first visit and must show a valid ID each time. Residents are limited to the number of visitors they can have on any day or at one time.

The number and type of visitors a resident may have depends on their status in the level system. Residents at the lowest level can only receive visits from approved family members. Residents at higher levels can add more people, including approved friends, to their visitor list.

JRA MONITORING

The Program Director and CRP Coordinator at Touchstone jointly developed an eight-page checklist, which is completed each month by the CRP Coordinator. This checklist notes where

the program exceeds licensing standards, meets licensing standards, or is unsatisfactory. The checklist appears to cover the main issues sometimes raised in annual reviews at various CRP facilities around the state. As a result, annual JRA reviews are said to be very favorable. While the most recent JRA report was not reviewed by the consultant, voluminous health and safety, licensing, and other reviews of the Touchstone facility and program were shared with the consultant team. While each reviewer found some issues requiring correction, all reviews were quite favorable.

The CRP Coordinator for Touchstone is estimated to be on-site between 15 and 20 hours per week. All site visits by the CRP Coordinator take place on weekdays during normal business hours. While the relationship between the CRP Coordinator and the program appears exemplary, the program director noted that the current CRP Coordinator is the seventh person to have this job in the last four years.

RELATIONS WITH THE COMMUNITY

Prior to Touchstone's arrival in early 1997, the facility was a group foster care home. According to all reports, this program was very unpopular with the neighbors. By way of example, it was reported that the program had more than 200 calls for police assistance in a single year. The facility and grounds were said "to look like a dump." Before this, the facility was the site of the OK Boys Ranch, which was closed following a scandal involving serious abuse of residents. Touchstone therefore moved into a neighborhood predisposed to skepticism about group homes.

Some of Touchstone's neighbors have been vocal in their opposition to the program since its arrival. The facility's 1969 conditional use permit has been challenged, and the program has been the subject of negative stories in the local newspaper. The fact that Touchstone's parent organization, Second Chance, was also the parent organization to Larch Way (the facility where a JRA youth raped and killed a young girl while he was living there) presumably also affects people's attitudes. The program director also believes that, since the facility is located near a school, neighbors sometimes confuse local high school students with Touchstone residents.

The program has an advisory committee which meets quarterly and includes at least one neighbor. It helps find jobs for residents at Touchstone, solicits donations, and helps with special services. The advisory committee was described as "very positive."

The program imposes a sanction of eight hours yard work for any resident caught smoking cigarettes. Since they haven't been able to stop the residents from smoking, the grounds look very good. It was stated that a street-end adjacent to the Touchstone property has been changed from an overgrown tangle into a well-maintained field in the process.

Schools

Despite the facility moving from Tumwater to Olympia, Touchstone youth who were of high school age continued to go to Tumwater High School through the end of the 1997-98 school year. (This was to allow continuity for students who started at Tumwater but who hadn't graduated by the time of the move.) Starting in the fall of 1998, all high school students from Touchstone attend Olympia High School.

The assistant principal at Tumwater High School said that their experience with Touchstone youth had been very good. She stated that it was "a very positive group of kids." She noted that they clearly understood the consequences of negative behavior.

The reaction of the administrator at Olympia High School was also positive. He stated that the Touchstone staff are "fantastic" and follow-up with the two youth in the school on "almost a daily basis." He noted that a well regarded Olympia High School teacher (now retired) works at Touchstone.

Employers

Touchstone residents work at a variety of locations in the Olympia area, including food service operations, Jiffy Lube, and a glass company.

The manager at Jiffy Lube said they have been hiring Touchstone residents since September 1997, and it has "worked well." Indeed, the manager said she "would hire more of them if I had room." She stressed that they are "here on time," and that "if they're scheduled, they're here." She described the relations with the group home as excellent. Group home employees stop by two or three times per day to check on the kids and sometimes call. If there is a problem, the group home helps work it out. Jiffy Lube has continued employment with some Touchstone youths who have completed their sentences. The manager would recommend hiring group home residents to other employers.

The manager at a pizza place said that he currently has one Touchstone resident as an employee and has had several in the past. He said they have all worked out well for him. He described them as "motivated workers." The present Touchstone resident working there was described as "a great guy." He would recommend hiring Touchstone residents to other employers.

The manager at a Burger King said that they have hired six Touchstone residents this year. He said two were excellent employees; three were average to above average employees; and one didn't work out. He said they fax a work schedule to the Touchstone staff, and the staff drive by to confirm that the youth is working. He described the Touchstone staff as very good with work with. When asked if he would recommend Touchstone residents to other employers he replied, "I just did today."

Law Enforcement

In communication with local law enforcement, the Olympia Police Chief referred us to a lieutenant who is a member of the Touchstone advisory committee. The lieutenant's assessment of the Touchstone program was very positive. He said that they "run a tight ship" and that Touchstone's "cooperation is better than any I've had with lots of different groups in the city." He cited a report he made to the City Council on calls for service at the Touchstone address and said that, in contrast to previous years (when there were "reams"), there are now very few. He described the program as "a completely different entity" from prior group home occupants at this address.

The lieutenant was well aware of the controversy in the neighborhood surrounding the group home and stated that he understood their concern, particularly with the change of mission at the facility from younger boys without criminal records to older juveniles who have been convicted of felonies.

Neighbors

Since moving in, Touchstone has made several attempts to communicate with neighbors and get to know them. They have developed a mailing list and send out flyers and quarterly newsletters. They have gone door to door and held three open houses since February 1997. It was reported that these open houses have been attended by up to 60 people. Despite these efforts, the Touchstone Group Home is far and away the most controversial program we visited.

Unlike any other neighborhood, several of the people surveyed called the office of Christopher Murray & Associates. The head of the neighborhood association wrote to WSIPP and challenged the validity of the survey. He also wrote to the head of JRA and to various political leaders in the legislature. Because of the controversy and complaints, more people were surveyed in the Touchstone neighborhood than any other community in the state. There were actually two mailings. The initial mailing was to 21 addresses supplied by the administrator of the group home based on a request to provide the addresses of the "20 or so nearest neighbors." When the head of the neighborhood association complained about the coverage of the survey, WSIPP had a title company research the addresses around the facility. Based on this evaluation, another seven surveys were mailed to nearby addresses not included in the original mailing.

Of the 28 surveys sent to Touchstone neighbors, fourteen were returned. Overall, the facility received a ranking as an "average neighbor." This is one of the lowest rankings in the state.

The "average" ranking of Touchstone is very deceptive. This is a neighborhood that is clearly polarized over the issue of a group home in its midst. To illustrate the polarized nature of neighborhood opinion, seven of the 14 respondents rated the Touchstone Group Home a "good" or "excellent" neighbor, while five rated it a "poor" or "very poor" neighbor. The remaining two respondents rated the facility an "average" neighbor. Four of the six "very poor" rankings given to all community facilities in the state were given to Touchstone.

Many respondents wrote comments; one even attached a list of all the past crimes that had been committed by juvenile offenders placed at Touchstone since February 1997. Two primary emotions were expressed by those who rated the facility a poor or very poor neighbor: anger and fear. In addition to issues relating to residents (bad language, intimidation, escape), allegations of reckless driving and speeding by staff were also mentioned by several respondents.

Negative comments included: "We are 75 years old and don't feel safe with these felons living there." "Can't sleep; affecting health, work, and relationships." "It's not a group home, it's a prison." "I and all my neighbors will take a 5-15% hit when we rent or sell." "I have to restrict my children from going down to the end of the street."

Positive comments included: "I am extremely glad to have them as neighbors ... I wish more of my neighbors were as nice as the group home (Touchstone) is." "They are wonderful ... I have lived here 22 years and have seen how it was before when it was the OK Boys Ranch. The

difference now is like night and day.” “They helped myself and other residents with work around the house for community service hours.” “I have been assured ever since I attended one of their open houses.”

BEST PRACTICES

Having an employee on-site at the school nearly every day (as Touchstone did at Tumwater High School) provides a level of supervision of youth and communication with teachers and other school personnel that is truly excellent. We saw only one other community residential program that had a dedicated school monitor. This practice works best with a homogenous population like Touchstone, where most of the residents are in the same school.

Touchstone’s vigorous program of community accountability checks is also impressive. It is noteworthy that the program is able to provide this level of service with a normal complement of staff. Clearly, the program has given this function a high priority.

TWIN RIVERS GROUP HOME RICHLAND, WASHINGTON

FACILITY AND NEIGHBORHOOD DESCRIPTION

Twin Rivers Group Home is a 16-bed male facility operated by JRA. Staff state that they are the “jack of all trades” in the group home business. They create programs for youth with a variety of needs and have never specialized. They do try to take tougher youth and more youth from the area. They have taken direct commits longer than any other group home. Youth are expected to work and go to school if they have not yet graduated.

Average lengths of stay are comparatively short; staff say “perhaps seven months.” They have between 50 and 55 admissions a year.

The facility was built in 1975 for its current purpose as a JRA facility. This facility, like most other group homes, has a large common living area, a schoolroom, staff space, and a residential hall. Boys sleep in eight double rooms off a corridor. A staff duty station looks into the living room and dining areas.

Twin Rivers is on the north side of downtown, about a mile from Richland’s main intersection. A residential neighborhood to the north is a well-established area and includes some very nice houses. The neighbor immediately to the east is a church. A block east is the main street through town, a Safeway, and other strip-mall businesses. To the south and west is a public housing development.

FACILITY SECURITY

The facility is a one-story, wood frame building, which gives the appearance of a residence. The unpaved parking area in the back, the basketball court next to it, and the tall light poles suggest otherwise. The exterior of the building is lit. It is fenced on the west and back.

Residents can exit the building in case of fire, and the two exit doors are alarmed. When residents are working in the yard or playing basketball, the alarm on the door off the dining area is deactivated. It is both alarmed and locked at night. The front door is only locked at night.

The hallway in the sleeping area has a motion detector so staff hear a buzz if a youth leaves his room at night. The windows in the area frequented by the youth are solid glass and do not open. The windows in the sleeping rooms can be opened but are heavily screened. Windows are not alarmed. Doors to the sleeping rooms are locked during the day to keep residents from entering someone else’s room.

The facility now has cameras on the back of the building, at the ends of the sleeping hallway, and in the TV room, a public space not easily seen from the office. The back yard camera sweeps the area and can zoom in on a specific location. The monitor is in the staff office. They do not maintain a video record. The office usually has staff in it during the day. During the evenings and nights, staff are likely to be elsewhere, interacting with youth in the public areas or doing laundry or other household chores.

Staff can carry radios when away from the building, there are radios in the vans, and the night staff person carries a panic button.

STAFFING

Six staff work during the 24 hours of any given day. Seven full-time and six intermittent staff cover the six positions. In addition, there is a facility administrator, a secretary, and a cook. The ten permanent staff have worked at Twin Rivers for some time. The average tenure (including the administrator, who has been there 18 years) is almost 11.5 years. The average age is 42.

Starting on a weekday morning, two staff are on duty. The second staff person is a resident counselor who rotates into that job from swing shift one day a week. He or she uses that time to make collateral contacts and to do paperwork. The facility administrator is usually there as well. On a normal day, youth go to school in the building. Depending on their work schedules, they may go to the morning school period, or they may go to school in the late afternoon. There are two teachers, one for each period.

Youth who have graduated or received a GED may work any time during the day. Jobs are restricted to Richland and the nearby Columbia Center. To have a job, a youth needs an approved plan for getting to and from work. Several businesses in the immediate area, Safeway for one, have a history of hiring residents of Twin Rivers.

From the time the first school period is over at 11 a.m. until about 4 p.m., more youths go off to jobs. Once a week, those who remain participate in an on-site program. On-site programs run by staff include anger management, cultural sensitivity, an anti-gang program, social skills, and HIV and other blood borne pathogens. Drug and alcohol services are provided by a contract agency as is sex offender treatment and individual psychological services. By 4 p.m., staff numbers increase to three, and on two days a week, to four. The next school period starts at 4:30 p.m. During the evenings, staff take youth to AA meetings.

Residents typically walk or take the bus to job sites. Occasionally, if staff do not trust a resident, they will take him to work. Residents who work late must call from work, and their supervisor must confirm that they will be late. Residents who are returning early must also call before leaving the job site. Youths check in and out at the office. Management has developed a three-point check system to ensure that residents are accurately checked in and out. There is a sign out log, a general log entry, and a work sheet showing a history of the locations of each youth. The three points must balance at each population count. Staff do random job checks at the job sites and do UAs and breathalyzer tests at job sites and on outings.

At night one staff person is on duty. This person checks on residents every half-hour, walks around the grounds three times a night, and also does a complete tour of the building's interior three times a night. The most serious incident involving a single night staff person occurred at Twin Rivers. A youth armed with a knife took the staff's personal vehicle after locking her in a closet. This staff person still works for Twin Rivers.

On Saturday, staff numbers parallel those of most weekdays. On Sunday, the numbers drop—to one on days, two on swing and one at night.

COMMUNITY RISK ASSESSMENT

The counselor does the community risk assessments. Staff use their one daytime shift to collect risk assessment information from collateral sources. The staff supervisor reviews the counselor's judgments. The staff think institutional staff manipulates the risk assessment data.

The institution's risk assessment score is not necessarily the same as Twin River's score. A check of records showed that CRAs at Twin Rivers are routine, timely, and in order.

Twin Rivers management is taking a new approach to CRAs. They now have monthly staff meetings. Partly in response to ACA standards (this facility is seeking accreditation in October 1998), they will use some of their monthly staff meeting time to review each case. In addition, they will staff cases twice a month. This process will add more information to the CRA process.

VIOLATIONS AND INFRACTIONS

Twin Rivers does not use a level system. Residents are expected to meet behavioral expectations from the beginning. If they do not, they may be assigned work hours, i.e., household chores, or placed on restriction. Restrictions vary from early to bed and limits on telephone and visiting privileges to movement only within the home or to go to work.

Staff described typical incidents as resulting from poor anger control, fighting, and arguing. They said residents rarely fail drug tests.

The resident interviewed said that swearing, horseplay, and smoking cigarettes could get one in minor trouble and result in work hours. A dirty UA, pornography, fighting, and escape can get one sent back to the institution. He thought that direct-commit youth did not understand how this worked. They did not appreciate that you have to earn your way to this kind of facility and then keep on earning your right to stay there.

The incident reports are kept chronologically in a loose-leaf notebook. The five incidents described since June were typical. One boy was pushing and received work hours. Two boys were hitting each other and were told to leave each other alone or there would be legal intervention. Another hit someone and received three work hours. One boy punched another and received a week on restrictions. The same boy was involved in several of these incidents and received escalating sanctions.

ESCAPE PROCEDURES

Escape is defined by Twin Rivers as an unauthorized absence from the area with no intention of returning. Staff consider an unauthorized absence an escape as soon as they realize someone is missing. This is true at the group home and at the job site. Staff do not chase a youth, but instead call law enforcement.

The last escape at an off-site location was in April 1998. The last escape from the facility was in March 1997. Between June 1996 and June 1997 six escapes occurred. One of these was the youth who put the staff person in a closet and stole her car, another had only been at Twin Rivers 27 hours, and one included a youth who walked away from work. The staff supervisor who reported him to law enforcement saw him. Two youths were intimidating a third, who ran and was picked up. The first two were reprimanded and they ran, jumping the back fence in the process.

VISITING

Visitation is daily until 10 p.m. The exception is during Saturday morning cleanup when visitors are not permitted. Visitors are family and friends, and all visits except those by parents are pre-

approved by the counselor. Visits are always supervised either directly by staff or on camera. Visits can only take place in public areas.

JRA MONITORING

JRA did an operation review audit in 1996. Audits take place annually and review fire, safety, medical and health care issues. Other audits are sporadic, and there has not been an unannounced visit from JRA staff.

RELATIONS WITH THE COMMUNITY

Richland is a relatively small community, and people working in related fields know each other. Most of the staff have been at Twin Rivers a long time and maintain good relationships with local residents and business people whom they find quite supportive of the facility. The present administrator has been there many years.

The youths interact with community members a lot: they walk back and forth to town or take the bus and work in neighbors' yards.

The facility does yet not have a Community Advisory Board but has identified several prospective members for one.

Schools

Twin Rivers has its own school. Until several years ago, the residents attended the public high school but then school staff asked that they not come. We were unable to reach the Hanford High School principal.

Employers

Several members of the business community regularly employ youth from Twin Rivers. When one boy leaves, they request another. No contact was made with employers of Twin Rivers' residents.

Justice System Representatives

Richland Police Department Chief Dave Lewis has had much contact with staff over the years, some concerning problems with residents, such as marijuana on the premises. He reported that the staff has been responsive and seem well connected to what they are doing. The Police Department receives notices when someone new comes or when someone leaves. The Chief does not think the general public is very aware of Twin Rivers. His mother lived in the nursing home next door for ten years, and nursing home staff and residents did not see any problems with the twin Rivers residents; they were "just the nice boys in the yard."

The Juvenile Court Administrator, Mary Hoffman, says that Twin Rivers has a very small effect on the court's workload. Detention houses the few residents who escape or commit a new offense, and the court processes new cases.

Neighbors

One neighbor is the United Church of Christ, whose minister says there have been no problems. The residents of Twin Rivers actually cleaned up a mess around the church that was made by

youth from the low-income housing project. Twin Rivers' staff have asked the minister to serve on their advisory committee.

A written survey was sent to five nearby residents. All five surveys were returned. Two neighbors said the facility was an “excellent neighbor,” two said it was a “good neighbor,” and one said it was an “average neighbor.” One of the respondents said, “I appreciate the concern shown by management that they not be a problem to the community.” The person rating them as an average neighbor noted “resident violent acts away from the facility” sometime in the past.

WOODINVILLE TREATMENT CENTER WOODINVILLE, WASHINGTON

FACILITY AND NEIGHBORHOOD DESCRIPTION

The Woodinville Treatment Center is a 15-bed state-run group home located in Woodinville. The facility was originally constructed in 1964 and has been in continuous operation as a state-run group home for juvenile offenders ever since.

There are two buildings on the site: the residential facility and a separate classroom building. Both are single story, wood-frame buildings. The residential facility has a living room, dining room, kitchen, sleeping wing, and office area. All bedrooms are multiple occupancy. The classroom building consists of a single large room. There is a small outdoor exercise area with a basketball hoop near the classroom building and a grassy backyard behind the residential facility.

The state owns about five acres surrounding the facility and much of the property is wooded. The facility sits back from the road and is almost entirely screened by vegetation. It was reported that because the facility is so well screened, and because the program keeps a low profile, many people in the neighborhood may not know it is a group home.

Isolation of the group home used to be more complete. When the facility was constructed, it was located at the end of a dirt road and was far from the rest of the community. Over the years, the Woodinville area has grown considerably and an arterial passes in front of the facility. Apartment buildings, condominiums, commercial establishments, and single family residences have all grown up around the group home.

FACILITY SECURITY

The Woodinville Treatment Center has as many security features as any community residential facility we saw this summer.

There are door alarms on all doors except the front door. (The staff duty-station is by the front door.) There are also security screens on all the bedroom windows and video cameras on the basement recreation area, in the classroom building, and at the driveway entrance. The site is fully fenced and well illuminated at night. The fence is not intended to keep people in, but to keep neighbors (particularly children) from wandering onto the site. There is also a vehicle gate on the driveway that is closed at night to secure the perimeter.

STAFFING

Two staff are on duty who have responsibility for supervising juvenile offenders during the day shift seven days a week. In addition, two support staff are on duty during the day shift on weekdays. The swing shift generally has three staff on duty, except on Tuesdays when there are four and Sundays when there are two. One staff person is on duty on the graveyard shift.

The average employee at Woodinville Group Home has worked there for more than eight years and has more than 12 and a half years working with juvenile offenders. The facility has had the same administrator for 17 years.

COMMUNITY RISK ASSESSMENT

Community risk assessments are conducted every 90 days. When a juvenile is placed at Woodinville, the secretary prepares a review schedule. When the review date comes up, the primary counselor assigned to the youth completes the risk assessment. The primary counselor must have at least two other counselors review and initial the risk assessment. These reviews can lead to modified assessments. Because the facility is so small, all the counselors have fairly detailed knowledge about each youth, including behavior while at school or work.

The administrator reported that this system has been in use at Woodinville for a long time, but that the requirement that additional counselors initial the CRA form is new. Prior to this change, it was reported there was always a requirement that other counselors review the risk assessment but there was no documentation of the review.

The completed risk assessment goes to the administrator for final review and approval, and the form is kept in the legal file and logged onto Mapper. Legal files were not reviewed at this facility.

VIOLATIONS AND INFRACTIONS

Until relatively recently, the Woodinville Treatment Center did not keep a written record of incidents. All incidents, large and small, are recorded in the log. It is therefore not possible to either count or categorize the number and type of past incidents at the Woodinville facility. It was reported that major incidents in the past (for example, those that would require a youth to be returned to an institution) were documented by a form called a Record of Official Action. These forms were not reviewed.

New policy and procedures promulgated by JRA now require all community residential facilities, including state-run group homes, to document infractions and other incidents on a standardized incident report form. Woodinville now follows this procedure and uses these forms.

The program uses a level system, and it was reported that there were approximately ten juveniles who had a change in level during FY 97 because of either minor or major infractions.

The program also reported that three juveniles were returned to a JRA institution in FY 97 because of major infractions. This is actually higher than the number of returns identified in a survey conducted by WSIPP. That survey identified two returns out of 20 placements in FY 97. The difference for this discrepancy is not known. Two returns is significantly below the statewide average. Even three returns out of 20 would be below the statewide average.

ESCAPE PROCEDURES

The Woodinville Treatment Center defines an escape as any unaccounted-for time. The program contacts local law enforcement, the JRA officer of the day, the victim (when applicable), and JRA administration (when applicable). While JRA policy requires more immediate contact, according to the program administrator, the King County Police would rather the group home not call until the youth has been absent for at least 24 hours.

According to JRA data, one escape occurred from the Woodinville Treatment Center in FY 97 and one in FY 98.

VISITING

Visiting takes place seven days a week in the public areas of the facility. Weekday visiting occurs during the afternoon after school. There are evening visits on Thursdays, Fridays, and Saturdays. Visitors are sometimes, but not always, under staff supervision.

First-time visitors are required to fill out a detailed questionnaire, and visitors are interviewed by staff. Visitors must be 16 years or older, not be on parole or probation, and are required to show picture ID.

JRA MONITORING

It was reported that JRA regional or headquarters staff rarely conduct formal reviews of the facility. The last formal review as said to have taken place in 1986.

It was also reported that JRA regional or headquarters staff have not had occasion to contact neighbors, schools, employers, or law enforcement about the performance of the program.

RELATIONS WITH THE COMMUNITY

Schools

The principal of Inglemoor High School reported no significant problems with students from the Woodinville Group Home. She said working relations with group home staff were good.

Employers

A Woodinville business that prepares snack trays for businesses has been hiring Woodinville Group Home residents for ten years. They currently have two JRA youth working for them. One is a lead packer on a production line, and both were described as “doing very well.” The manager said, “If we’re down a position, they [the group home] are the first I call.” The manager noted that they have hired many Woodinville Group Home residents over the years and some of them haven’t work out. When it doesn’t, “mostly it’s an attitude problem.” If there is a problem, they fire the worker, and he goes back to the group home. Site checks are not disruptive to the business. They’re done by staff “real quickly.” The manager knows three or four staff by name.

A tire shop in Woodinville has also been hiring Woodinville Group Home residents for many years. The manager said that about 50 percent work out and 50 percent don’t. He noted that the work is hard, and those that work out are “reliable kids” and “hard workers.” If somebody doesn’t work out, the group home “just takes him back.” He commented that the kids are well supervised and screened for drug usage. He said that staff don’t often stop by, but they call to request copies of time cards. He called it “a great program” and said he would recommend group home hires to “any business.” He said that the facility is also an excellent source for casual labor.

A business that makes furniture on contract has been hiring Woodinville Group Home residents for about a year. According to the manager, some have worked out, others haven’t. As she put it, “We’re busy, and we can’t use flaky kids.” While the business has had one group home resident working for them for six months, it is more common for kids to leave employment before this when they leave the group home. She described it as frustrating to lose employees after training them. She said that staff “come by all the time” to check on kids. She would recommend Woodinville Group Home hires to other employers.

A small landscaping firm operating out of Woodinville has had one group home resident working for him for a year. He has also employed two others part-time. All were described as “hard workers” and “great with customers.” The JRA youth who has worked for him for a year was described as a “fantastic employee.” He hopes that he will continue to work for him after he is released from JRA. His only reservation is with the restrictions put on JRA residents. This one employee is so good, he would like to be able to send him out on jobs by himself.

This last employer volunteered that “I used to be against programs like this. It use to hack me off that we help kids like this with tax dollars.” He went on to explain that he got a DUI eight years ago and that “the court allowed me to get well.” Now he says, “these kids really do want to make it. Its cool.” He wasn’t sure what it is that group home staff do, but “the things they are teaching are great.”

Justice System Representatives

Officer Williams of the King County Sheriff’s Department was very positive in his assessment of the Woodinville Group Home. He stated that the staff do a good job of supervising the residents, and he’s had no problems with the facility. He says escape notifications have worked well and the office gets advance notification of all new residents placed at the facility.

Officer Williams said there have been “inquiries, but not complaints” about the facility from neighbors. He believes many people don’t even know it’s there.

The King County Juvenile Court and Juvenile Probation have nothing to do with juvenile offenders at Woodinville Group Home.

Neighbors

As noted above, Woodinville Group Home is located on a mostly wooded, five-acre parcel of land. Its nearest residential neighbors are in a condominium complex across the street. Other nearby neighbors are mainly commercial establishments.

According to the manager of the condominium complex (who has lived there for ten years), there have been no problems associated with the group home. They don’t cause any noise and “the kids tend to their business.”

Repeated calls to other, more distant, neighborhood association representatives were unanswered.

WOODLAWN FAITH HOME TACOMA, WASHINGTON

FACILITY AND NEIGHBORHOOD DESCRIPTION

Woodlawn Faith Home is a small specialized group home for pregnant teenage girls operated by Faith Homes of Tacoma, Washington. Faith Homes provides residential and transitional housing and other programs in several cities in Washington State. Their Woodlawn facility is licensed for five residents. However, since the residence has only four bedrooms, they take only four girls if all the girls have had their babies or if the girls are particularly close to their due dates. The facility takes both JRA girls and DCFS placements. On the day of the site visit, five girls were in residence, including one from JRA.

Woodlawn will take up to four JRA girls and has a guaranteed contract for two. However, as the executive director of Faith Homes explained, Woodlawn is the only licensed program for DCFS and JRA placements of its kind in the state. While she was referring to both DCFS and JRA placements, in her words, "We could keep three Woodlawns full." While the Director of Faith Homes maintained that the agency does not bill JRA for vacant beds if they fall below their minimum, according to JRA "Woodlawn has consistently billed JRA for unfilled beds each month."⁶

The facility is located in a well-maintained neighborhood of single family residences in the west end of Tacoma. The facility looks like any other house in the neighborhood. It is a split level, wood frame residence with two bedrooms upstairs and two bedrooms downstairs. The kitchen, dining room, and living room are upstairs, and a recreation room is downstairs. The garage was enclosed some time in the past to make an office. The facility has a small fenced back yard.

Normally, a program of this size would not be economical to run. Indeed, according to the executive director, it is only because of outside financial support that the program is able to function at all. In addition to DCFS and JRA contract revenue, it was reported that Woodlawn receives \$25,000 per year from United Way and another \$50,000 per year from other donations. The program also has a very low mortgage on the house it occupies.

The facility was opened as a group home in 1992. Public hearings (required by the city's conditional use permit process) were held when Woodlawn became a group home. According to the executive director, the hearings were without controversy.

FACILITY SECURITY

Security at Woodlawn consists of baby gates at the top and bottom of the stairs and at the kitchen doors and safety plugs in the electrical outlets. There are no door or window alarms or any other devices commonly associated with facility security.

However, the executive director was very clear that "we can't be lulled" by the fact that the residents are all pregnant teenagers. As she noted, "Any of these girls can do something." For example, Faith Homes had a serious problem some time ago at another facility (which does not take JRA referrals) when a girl ran off with her boyfriend who had just gotten out of jail. The two were subsequently involved in a robbery and murder. While this is an extreme and rare event,

⁶ Correspondence from Karla Blake, Assistant Regional Administrator, Region 5, dated September 23, 1998.

Faith Homes made staff, policy, and training changes as a result of this incident. It was reported that the organization is rethinking its no-decline contract with DCFS.

Faith Homes is now installing window and door sensors on the home where this incident took place. Door sensors will be installed on interior, as well as exterior, doors. Their intention is to do this in a way that does not look institutional. They believe a non-institutional appearance is especially important for DCFS girls. The cost of this system (for six bedrooms) was reported to be about \$2,000.

Woodlawn reported that there have been no problems with schools or employers using the new written agreements required for JRA placements.

The requirements for accountability checks on JRA youth are more frequent than for DCFS referrals. It was reported that JRA girls in the community (at school or work) are checked twice per week. This occurs either by phone or by drive-by check by a staff person on the way to or from work. Accountability checks are recorded in the daily log and in the youth's accountability log.

The director noted that the program sometimes goes for long periods of time with no JRA youth in residence. As a result, it was reported that employees sometimes forget policies and procedures relating to JRA placements. This, coupled with that fact that the average employee's tenure at Woodlawn is very short (see below), presumably increases the chance of oversight or error in following some of the procedures JRA considers important.

STAFFING

Two staff are on duty on weekdays and evenings. On weekends and at nights there is one. The program has six full-time employees (32 hours or more per week) and six part-time employees.

The average employee has worked at Woodlawn less than one year, and no one has been there for more than two years. The average employee has worked just over three years with juvenile offenders. However, one part-time employee who has 22 years experience working with juvenile offenders skews the average. The eleven other employees average 1.3 years. The program manager has worked with juvenile offenders for four years.

JRA reports that this level of staff turnover is a problem for them, particularly when there is a mix of JRA and DCFS youth who are subject to different rules and standards. High staff turnover requires that more staff be trained and increases the number of times when staff inexperience and lack of knowledge is the source of a problem.

COMMUNITY RISK ASSESSMENT

The CRP coordinator, case manager, and other staff familiar with the resident complete community risk assessments. While these are completed every 90 days as required by JRA, it was reported that "informal" risk assessments are done more frequently.

The case file of the one JRA girl in residence was reviewed. This girl had been at Woodlawn for only two weeks. However, a new risk assessment was actually due on the day of her admission to Woodlawn, and the new assessment (assuming that it had been done at the institution) had not yet been received from JRA.

VIOLATIONS AND INFRACTIONS

Woodlawn has two levels of incidents. More serious incidents are submitted in writing to JRA or DCFS (and CPS if appropriate). The same form is used for both agencies. Less serious incidents are handled internally. Like other programs, incidents at Woodlawn include issues which are not infractions. For example, medical referrals (which are naturally more frequent with this population) are incidents that are reported. The one JRA resident who had only been there two weeks had not been involved in any incidents. Since inactive case files are kept elsewhere, it was not possible to check other incident reports.

It was reported that acting out behavior is very rare at Woodlawn. The most common serious violation is being absent without leave. According to a survey conducted by WSIPP, one of the seven JRA girls admitted to Woodlawn in FY 97 was returned to a JRA institution.

Woodlawn is one of the few privately-run community residential facilities that does not use a level system. The program manager stated that, since the facility is so small, things are better handled in a less formal way. It was stated that issues are often handled with in-house sanctions developed at team meetings.

According to JRA, the lack of a level system “confuses the issue of who is eligible for incentives and/or sanctions,” and that as a result “when disagreements occur, there is a lack of consistent problem solving process and documentation to make a decision.”⁷ JRA has reportedly suggested that Woodlawn adopt a level system or in-house daily point system.

ESCAPE PROCEDURES

Woodlawn reports that it begins escape procedures on JRA clients after ten minutes of unaccounted for time in the community. Woodlawn’s escape procedures require notification of the program manager, the JRA officer of the day, Oakridge Group Home, the CRP Coordinator, law enforcement, and the youth’s parent or guardian.

While the director noted that their problem is more often trying to get the girls off the couch than keeping them from running away, there have been escapes from Woodlawn. Three JRA girls were recorded as escapes from Woodlawn in FY 97. However, according to JRA data no escapes by JRA girls have occurred since October 1996.

VISITING

Visiting is limited to family members and mentors, and all visitors are required to complete a visitor information form. It was reported that background checks are conducted on visitors, and staff interview visitors before their first visit.

Visiting hours are flexible and are arranged on an individual basis. Visiting takes place throughout the small facility. Visitors are therefore not always under direct staff supervision.

⁷ Correspondence from Kara Blake, Assistant Regional Administrator, Region 5, dated September 23, 1998.

JRA MONITORING

JRA conducts formal reviews once a year. The last review of Woodlawn Faith Home was in June 1998. According to this report, the program is in substantial compliance with current JRA requirements with only minor discrepancies noted.

The CRP coordinator reports that she tries to visit the program every working day if there is a JRA girl in residence. The program reports that the CRP coordinator is on-site an average of about five hours per week.

RELATIONS WITH COMMUNITY

It was reported that the community is very quiet. There are no known neighborhood associations (although a block watch sign was located near the group home).

According to the program manager, the group home has a very low profile in the neighborhood. Despite the fact that there were community meetings when the program was opened, she doubts many people even know they are there or what they do.

A survey was sent to the 12 nearest addresses to Woodlawn Faith Home to assess community knowledge and opinions about the facility and program. Four surveys were returned. On a five-point scale ranging from excellent to very poor, two of the four respondents rated the facility as an "excellent neighbor," one said it was a "good neighbor," and one said it was an "average neighbor." None of the respondents reported any problems with the home in the last 12 months. Two respondents, who have lived in the neighborhood for ten years and eight years, reported occasional problems in the past with loud music, kids congregating, and kissing and petting on the front lawn. Based on the comments of one of these respondents, this apparently happened when the facility was a group home for boys.

The executive director stated that Faith Homes would like to have a community advisory board to assist with fund-raising, marketing, special events, community support, and special services such as legal advice. While she noted that, while pregnant girls might not present much of a threat to a screening committee that included community members, there are liability and confidentiality issues that are troublesome in the screening and acceptance process.

OTHER ISSUES

Woodlawn Faith Home was the site of the most troublesome story about referrals from JRA institutions that we encountered this summer. According to the executive director from Faith Homes, an administrative override was requested in late spring 1998 to place a girl from Echo Glen Children's Center at Woodlawn. It was reported that this override request included false statements alleging that Woodlawn would accept the girl and was holding a bed open for her. It was also reported that the override request implied that the girl's probation officer was in agreement with this decision. In fact, neither was true.

Before the placement could be made, the director recognized the name of the girl as a client who had been referred by DCFS to another Faith Homes residence in Vancouver, Washington. She was known from that experience to be a high-risk DCFS runner who had previously fled on numerous occasions. The girl was reported to be a drug-addicted 14-year-old prostitute with a year left on her sentence. The placement was not made and, according to JRA, the girl had her baby at Echo Glen where she is currently going through court proceedings to determine what access she can have to her child.

We have not seen the paperwork requesting this override. Not all verbal reports are in agreement concerning this girl's characteristics. However, the important details (i.e., that she was a high-risk DCFS runner and there were inaccuracies or deception in the override request) were confirmed by the Assistant Regional Administrator and the CRP Coordinator.

According to JRA, the administrator at Echo Glen agreed to the override because: "1) the youth had improved her behavior since her incarceration; 2) staff felt was taking the birth of her child seriously and as a life changing event; 3) staff also believe if the girl remained at Echo Glen she would not be capable of forming an emotional relationship with her child and; 4) [her] original offense was not a serious or violent offense."⁸

The origin of statements in the override request that can be viewed as inaccurate or deceptive remain in dispute. The Assistant Regional Administrator in Region 5 (who ultimately denied the placement at Woodlawn) does not believe deception occurred.

⁸ Correspondence from Kara Blake, Assistant Regional Administrator, Region 5, dated September 23, 1998.

APPENDIX B: FORMS USED IN THE STUDY

Self-Assessment form for Privately Operated Facilities

Self-Assessment form for State Operated Facilities

Neighborhood Survey

COMMUNITY RESIDENTIAL PLACEMENT FACILITIES SELF-ASSESSMENT AND CONSULTANT AUDIT

BACKGROUND

During the 1998 session, the Washington State Legislature passed ESSB 6445 which, among other things, directs that a special study be made of Community Residential Placement facilities housing juvenile offenders under the jurisdiction of the Juvenile Rehabilitation Administration. Substantial portions of the study are being conducted by Christopher Murray & Associates, a Seattle-based consultant specializing in justice agency issues, under contract with the Washington State Institute for Public Policy.

The items in this self-assessment checklist were either specifically named by the legislature for inclusion in the study, or are needed to answer more general questions raised by the legislation. The inclusion or wording of questions should not be construed as advocacy for any particular position. There are no "right" answers. Your assistance in providing this information is appreciate.

THE ASSESSMENT PROCESS

The assessment process will take place in two phases: a self-assessment and a site inspection/audit by a member of the consultant team.

Self Assessment: The self-assessment phase is represented by this checklist. Please complete the checklist and send the original or a legible copy to the consultant by July 6, 1998. The consultant's address and fax number are shown at the end of the checklist.

Inspection/Audit: You will be contacted by your JRA Regional Administrator or designee to schedule a date for the inspection/audit by the consultant. The CRP director and key staff should be available for on-site interview by the consultant. Every effort will be made to make this a mutually convenient time.

While the audit will be less extensive than periodic audits by JRA and licensing agencies, you may be asked by the consultant to provide documentation regarding any of the issues identified in the self-assessment checklist. In particular, the consultant may want to examine written policies and procedures; staff schedules; facility/program rules and regulations; documentation of infractions, documentation of escapes, incident reports and daily logs. The consultant will want to inspect all parts of the facility and grounds and may interview staff or residents at random.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR FOLLOW-UP AND COMMENT

The consultant will prepare a draft report for each facility that will be shared with JRA, the Regional Administrator, and the director at each CRP facility. Comments are encouraged and welcomed by the consultant. Comments should be made in writing and returned within a week of receiving the draft report.

SELF-ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST

Please fill in the blanks or check the appropriate boxes as requested. If you need space to provide additional information, please do so on a separate sheet, cross reference the numbered item in the checklist, and attached your comments to this form.

Agency & Facility/Program Name: _____

Address: _____

Contact person & telephone number: _____

GENERAL

1. How many beds do you provide to JRA? Total: _____ Guaranteed: _____
2. Do you provide beds at this location to any other DSHS, state or federal program? Yes No
If yes, how many? _____ To whom? _____
If yes, do JRA youth share bedrooms with non-JRA youth? Yes No
3. Do JRA youth share bedrooms with other JRA youth? Yes, all do Yes, some do No
4. When was this facility first opened? _____
5. Did the facility house juvenile offenders when it first opened? Yes No
6. To your knowledge, were community hearings held regarding siting of this facility? Yes No Don't know
7. Do you have an advisory board that includes community members? Yes No
If yes, does the advisory board review decisions to place individual offenders here? Yes No

STAFFING

8. What is the typical number of staff on duty who have responsibility for supervising or providing programs to juvenile offenders? If some staff have responsibilities

SUPERVISORY / PROGRAM STAFFING (FTES) BY SHIFT AND DAY OF WEEK

Shift	Mon.	Tues.	Wed.	Thurs.	Fri.	Sat.	Sun.
Day							
Evening							
Night							

for both JRA and non-JRA youth, include all of their time here and estimate the time spent on JRA youth under question 11.

9. How many support staff (cooks, administrative staff, etc.) do you have? On weekdays _____ On weekends _____
10. Do you use intermittent staff or other relief coverage when regular staff are absent? Yes, always Yes, sometimes No
11. Using the form on page 3, please list all staff currently employed at this facility.

FACILITY SECURITY

12. Are juvenile offenders ever locked in their rooms or building so that they need staff assistance to get out? Yes No
If yes, when? _____
13. Are exterior doors equipped with alarms, video monitors, or other security features so that unauthorized departures or visits can be detected when staff cannot see the doors? Yes, all doors Yes, some doors No
If yes, what types of security features do you have? _____
14. Are exterior windows equipped with alarms, video monitors, other security features, or somehow configured to detect or prevent entry or egress? Yes, all windows Yes, some windows No
If yes, what types of security features do you have? _____
If yes, can these features prevent the passing of contraband through windows? Yes No
15. Which, if any, of the following features do you have? (check all that apply) Fully fenced grounds Outdoor monitoring cameras Exterior lighting on all sides of the building Intrusion (burglar) alarm on building Other outdoor security features (Please describe other features) _____

VISITING (Attach copy of policy if appropriate)

16. What are your visiting days and hours? _____
17. Who may visit juvenile offenders? _____
18. What process is used to screen visitors? _____
19. Is (Are) the visiting area(s) under direct staff supervision whenever visitors are present? Always Sometimes Never

ESCAPES AND INFRACTIONS

20. How do you define "escape?" _____
21. How long must a juvenile be gone before the absence is considered an escape? _____
22. Using these definitions, when was the last time you had an escape from your facility? _____ From elsewhere? _____
23. Who is notified when there is an escape? _____
24. Do you have a written list of infractions/violations that can result in disciplinary action? Yes No
If yes, please attach a copy
25. Do you keep a written record of incident reports? Yes No
If yes, how many incident reports were written between 7/1/96 and 6/30/97? _____
26. Do you use a level system? Yes No
If yes, how many incidents between 7/1/96 and 6/30/97 resulted in a change in level for a juvenile offender? _____
27. How many incidents between 7/1/96 and 6/30/97 resulted in a return of a juvenile offender to a JRA institution or filing of new criminal charges? _____

JRA MONITORING

28. How many hours is a JRA CRP Coordinator at your facility during a typical week? _____
29. Is the CRP Coordinator ever on-site during the evening? Yes No At night? Yes No On weekends? Yes No
30. How often does JRA conduct formal performance reviews of your facility/program? _____
31. When was the last time you had a formal performance review by JRA? _____
32. Has JRA ever conducted an unannounced performance review of your facility/program? Yes No
If yes, when was the last time this happened? _____
If yes, have any of these reviews been at night? Yes No On weekends? Yes No
33. To your knowledge, do JRA staff ever contact any of the following to determine whether juvenile offenders in your facility are disruptive or that your staff are responsive to community concerns?
Neighbors: Yes No Don't know Schools: Yes No Don't know
Employers: Yes No Don't know Law enforcement: Yes No Don't know

PROGRAMS

34. Using the form on page 4, please describe the on-site programs offered to juvenile offenders at this facility.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE.
PLEASE MAIL OR FAX THE COMPLETED MATERIALS
BY JULY 6, 1998 TO:

Christopher Murray & Associates
2016 18th Avenue East
Seattle, Washington 98112
FAX: (206) 328-1357

JRA GROUP HOME SELF-ASSESSMENT AND CONSULTANT AUDIT

BACKGROUND

During the 1998 session, the Washington State Legislature passed ESSB 6445 which, among other things, directs that a special study be made of community residential facilities and group homes housing juvenile offenders under the jurisdiction of the Juvenile Rehabilitation Administration. Substantial portions of the study are being conducted by Christopher Murray & Associates, a Seattle-based consultant specializing in justice agency issues, under contract with the Washington State Institute for Public Policy.

The items in this self-assessment checklist were either specifically named by the legislature for inclusion in the study, or are needed to answer more general questions raised by the legislation. The inclusion or wording of questions should not be construed as advocacy for any particular position. There are no "right" answers. Your assistance in providing this information is appreciated.

THE ASSESSMENT PROCESS

The assessment process will take place in two phases: a self-assessment and a site inspection/audit by a member of the consultant team.

Self Assessment: The self-assessment phase is represented by this checklist. Please complete the checklist and send the original or a legible copy to the consultant by July 6, 1998. The consultant's address and fax number are shown at the end of the checklist.

Inspection/Audit: You will be contacted by your JRA Regional Administrator or designee to schedule a date for the inspection/audit by the consultant. The group home director and key staff should be available for on-site interview by the consultant. Every effort will be made to make this a mutually convenient time.

The consultant may want to examine written policies and procedures, staff schedules, facility/program rules and regulations, documentation of infractions, documentation of escapes, incident reports, and daily logs. The consultant will want to inspect all parts of the facility and grounds and may interview staff or residents at random.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR FOLLOW-UP AND COMMENT

The consultant will prepare a draft report for each facility that will be shared with JRA, the Regional Administrator, and the director at each group home. Comments are encouraged and welcomed by the consultant. Comments should be made in writing and returned within a week of receiving the draft report.

SELF-ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST

Please fill in the blanks or check the appropriate boxes as requested. If you need space to provide additional information, please do so on a separate sheet, cross reference the numbered item in the checklist, and attached your comments to this form.

Facility/Program Name: _____

Address: _____

Contact person and telephone number: _____

GENERAL

1. How many beds do you have? _____
2. When was this facility first opened? _____
3. Was the facility initially opened as a group home for juvenile offenders? Yes No Don't know
4. To your knowledge, were community hearings held regarding siting of this facility? Yes No Don't know
5. Do you have an advisory board that includes community members? Yes No
If yes, does the advisory board review decisions to place individual offenders here? Yes No

STAFFING

6. What is the typical number of staff on duty who have responsibility for supervising or providing programs to juveniles? (Please count staff in full-time equivalents by shift and day of week.)

SUPERVISORY/PROGRAM STAFF BY SHIFT AND DAY OF WEEK

Shift	Mon.	Tues.	Wed.	Thurs.	Fri.	Sat.	Sun.
Day							
Evening							
Night							

7. How many support staff (cooks, clerical, etc.) do you have? Weekdays _____ Weekends _____
8. Do you use intermittent staff or other relief coverage when regular staff are absent? Yes, always Yes, sometimes No
9. Using the form on page 3, please list all staff currently employed at this facility.

FACILITY SECURITY

- 10. Are juvenile offenders ever locked in their rooms so that they need staff assistance to get out? Yes No
If yes, when? _____
- 11. Are juvenile offenders ever locked in the building so that they need staff assistance to get out? Yes No
If yes, when? _____
- 12. Are exterior doors equipped with alarms, video monitors, or other security features so that unauthorized departures or visits can be detected when staff cannot see the doors? Yes, all doors Yes, some doors No
If yes, what types of security features do you have? _____
- 13. Are exterior windows equipped with security screens, alarms, video monitors, other security features, or somehow configured to detect or prevent entry or egress? Yes, all windows Yes, all bedroom windows No
If yes, what types of security features do you have? _____
If yes, can these features prevent the passing of contraband through windows? Yes No
- 14. Which, if any, of the following features do you have (check all that apply)? Fully fenced grounds Outdoor monitoring cameras Exterior lights on all sides of building Intrusion (burglar) alarm on building Other outdoor security feature(s) (Please describe other features) _____
- 15. Do juvenile offenders share bedrooms? Yes, all do Yes, some do No

VISITING (Attach copy of policy if appropriate)

- 16. What are your visiting days and hours? _____
- 17. Who may visit juvenile offenders? _____
- 18. What process is used to screen visitors? _____
- 19. Is (Are) the visiting area(s) under direct staff supervision whenever visitors are present? Always Sometimes Never

ESCAPES AND INFRACTIONS

- 20. How do you define "escape?" _____
- 21. How long must a juvenile be gone before the absence is considered an escape? _____
- 22. Using these definitions, when was the last time you had an escape from your facility? _____ From elsewhere? _____
- 23. Who is notified when there is an escape? _____
- 24. Do you have a written list of infractions/violations that can result in disciplinary action? Yes No
If yes, please attach a copy.
- 25. Do you keep a written record of incident reports? Yes No
If yes, how many incidents occurred in your facility between 7/1/96 and 6/30/97? _____
- 26. Do you use a level system? Yes No
If yes, how many incidents between 7/1/96 and 6/30/97 resulted in a change in level for a juvenile offender? _____
- 27. How many incidents between 7/1/96 and 6/30/97 resulted in a return of a juvenile to a JRA institution or filing of new criminal charges? _____

JRA MONITORING

- 26. How often does JRA regional or headquarters staff conduct formal performance reviews of your facility? _____
- 27. When was the last time you had a formal performance review by JRA? _____
- 28. Has JRA ever conducted an unannounced performance review of your facility/program? Yes No
If yes, when was the last time this happened? _____
If yes, have any of these reviews been at night? Yes No On weekends? Yes No
- 29. To your knowledge, do JRA regional or headquarters staff ever contact any of the following to determine whether juvenile offenders in your facility are disruptive or that your staff are responsive to community concerns?
Neighbors: Yes No Don't know Schools: Yes No Don't know
Employers: Yes No Don't know Law enforcement: Yes No Don't know

PROGRAMS

- 30. Using the form on page 4, please describe the on-site programs offered to juvenile offenders at this facility.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE.
PLEASE MAIL OR FAX THE COMPLETED MATERIALS
BY JULY 6, 1998 TO:

Christopher Murray & Associates
2016 18th Avenue East
Seattle, Washington 98112
FAX: (206) 328-1357

NEIGHBORHOOD SURVEY

This survey is being conducted by Christopher Murray & Associates of Seattle Washington. It is being done as part of a statewide study of group homes for juveniles that are partly, or entirely, funded by the Department of Social and Health Services, Juvenile Rehabilitation Administration (JRA). The study is required by the Washington State Legislature (Senate Bill 6445) and may be used by the legislature as it considers new laws and regulations about group homes for juveniles.

_____, is a group home for juveniles in your neighborhood. Please answer the following questions about this group home. You can return the survey by folding and taping it closed. No postage is necessary. Thank you for your participation.

1. How long have you lived in this neighborhood? _____ years
 2. Are you aware that this facility is a group home for juveniles?
 Yes
 No
 3. Is the yard and property of the group home maintained up to neighborhood standards?
 Yes
 No
 4. Does the group home cause traffic or parking problems in your neighborhood?
 Yes
 No
 5. Have you ever had to complain to group home management or staff about anything concerning the group home or its residents?
 Yes
 No
If yes, about what? _____
If yes, was their response satisfactory to you? Yes No
 6. Do you know any of the management or staff who work at the group home by sight or name?
 Yes
 No
 7. Has management or staff at the group home talked with you, invited you in, sent you written materials, or otherwise tried to communicate with you?
 Yes
 No
 8. Do you, or would you, feel comfortable talking with group home management or staff about a problem you wanted resolved?
 Yes
 No
 9. In the last 12 months have you personally experienced problems with this group home or its residents?
 Yes
 No
If yes, what? _____
 10. In the last 12 months has anyone you know experienced problems with this group home or its residents?
 Yes
 No
If yes, what? _____
 11. Have there been problems with this group home or its residents in prior years about which you are concerned?
 Yes
 No
If yes, what and when? _____
 12. Does the group home or its residents make any positive contributions to the community that you know about (for example, litter control, vacant lot maintenance, graffiti removal, etc.)?
 Yes
 No
If yes, how? _____
 13. Does having this group home in your neighborhood change how you live?
 Yes
 No
If yes, how? _____
 14. Overall, how would you rate this group home as a neighbor?
 Excellent Good Average Poor Very poor
 15. Is there anything else that you would like to share about the group home? (Use other side if necessary)
-

APPENDIX C: JRA FORMS REFERENCED IN THE REPORT

Community Risk Assessment

Conditions of School Involvement, School Agreement

Conditions of Employment, Employer Agreement

JRA Community Facility Violation/Incident Report