



Attachment A

(dated April 22, 2014)

Assessment Plan for the Prosecuting Attorney's Office's 180 Program

Introduction

In accordance and in compliance with the 2014 Budget Ordinance, 17696, Section 29, Proviso P1, staff from the Office of Performance, Strategy and Budget (PSB) and the Prosecuting Attorney's Office (PAO) worked collaboratively to develop a plan to assess the 180 Program's actual impact on delinquent behaviors, to describe the data that will be relied upon, and to provide a timetable for the assessment and an estimate of the assessment cost.

Historical Background

The PAO first launched the 180 Program as a pilot pre-filing diversion program in July of 2011, and launched it as a formal program in January of 2012, with the goal of diverting 350 youth out of our criminal justice system. The PAO met that goal and, in 2012, diverted 353 youth, the majority of whom were youth of color, out of the criminal justice system. In 2013, the 180 Program diverted 310 youth out of the criminal justice system.

A 2012 process evaluation of the 180 Program conducted by the University of Washington found that the program is effective at reaching youth, inspiring them to change, and helping them identify the assets and liabilities in their lives that can help or hinder their desire to change. The evaluation also revealed that the effects of the 180 Program stayed with youth over time, that the program was effective in changing attitudes and behavior.

Because the 180 Program diverts approximately 350 youth out of the juvenile court system each year, there is a corresponding annual savings of \$205,350 in public defense costs alone¹. This figure does not include the savings in detention and court costs from keeping these youth out of the criminal justice system. Nor does this figure calculate the immeasurable costs to youth's own self-image as a criminal, in handcuffs, in a police car, and booked into detention. The PAO's 180 Program instead returns youth to their community, to hear from respected community leaders and others with criminal justice experience about the consequences of their decisions to participate in crime.

¹ 350 x \$700 (average case credit cost) = \$245,000. Since only 83 percent of cases receive a public defender, total savings is \$245,000 x .83 = \$203,350.

As part of the 2014 budget process, the King County Council requested that the PAO and PSB work collaboratively on an outcome evaluation of the 180 Program, and submit it to Council by March 1, 2014.

180 Program Assessment Objective

The objective of the 180 Program assessment is as follows:

By September 30, 2014, deliver to the project sponsors in PSB and PAO a final outcome evaluation assessing the extent to which the 180 Program reduces recidivism or disproportionate minority contact (DMC) at six and 12 months following workshop participation. DMC refers to the overrepresentation or underrepresentation of youth of color at different stages in the Juvenile Justice System relative to their numbers in the general population and in comparison to the reference group (i.e. Caucasian youth).

Description of How The Assessment Will Be Conducted

The lead evaluator, a PSB staff member, will examine youths' individual trajectories in the juvenile justice system, and collectively compare youth who participated in the 180 Program with a similar, matched group. The evaluator will further compare any available measures to determine the Equity and Social Justice (ESJ) impacts of the 180 Program in an effort to determine if the program is helping to reduce disparity in the juvenile justice system. Stakeholders will be interviewed to provide qualitative data that cannot easily be quantified.

Data Relied Upon

The 180 Program assessment will rely upon PAO data pertaining to youth who were referred to the program during calendar year 2012. In addition, PSB may also examine and rely on data from 2011 and 2013 as it necessary to better understand or provide context to or comparators for the 2012 data.

Data to be provided by the PAO and utilized by PSB includes:

- Referral Number;
- Information on whether the referral was a diversion return;
- Information on whether the referral was the result of PAO discretion;
- Information on whether the referral was returned to the PAO for filing;
- Contact and/or geographic information relating youth referred to 180 (primarily zip codes)

PSB analysts will validate the data from the PAO against JIMS (juvenile court case database) to ensure that the data matches (if it is supposed to) and to correct any errors. This work will ensure appropriate data matching and consistent performance measurement calculations.

Recidivism Measures

The assessment will measure “recidivism events” utilizing the Washington State Institute for Public Policy definition of that term, as follows:

A **recidivism event** is any offense committed after release to the community that results in a Washington State court legal action.

"Court legal action" includes a conviction, deferred sentence, deferred prosecution, deferred disposition, or a diversion agreement as defined by Washington State statute for misdemeanors, gross misdemeanors, and felonies.

"Release to the community" means an offender is released from a commitment order to a juvenile or adult state correctional facility, or from a county jail, after completing a sentence or disposition of confinement; or when an offender is released into the community following a sentence or disposition of community supervision.

"Confinement" includes placement in a state-contracted correctional institution, work release program, group home, or in a city/county-operated jail.

"Community supervision" includes parole, community placement, detention, electronic monitoring, and probation, special community sentencing alternatives in lieu of confinement, deferred sentences/adjudications, deferred prosecutions/dispositions, and diversion.

The Washington State Center for Court Research reports that this is the most commonly used measure of recidivism.

In accordance with this measure, the assessment will evaluate the extent to which the 180 Program reduces recidivism at six and 12 months following workshop participation. The assessment will also evaluate the extent to which the program reduces DMC at six and 12 months following workshop participation.

Timetable For The Assessment

It is the goal of PSB and the PAO to complete the 180 Program assessment by September 30, 2014 and to share the results with all relevant stakeholders and interested parties in October and November of 2014.

Below is a summary of the assessment timeline:

<u>Month</u>	<u>Task</u>	<u>Status</u>
Jan.	Examine test data	completed
Jan.	Preliminary data assessment meeting	completed
Jan.	Identify available data and source	completed

Feb.	PAO shares data with PSB	completed
Feb.	PAO and PSB clean data as needed	completed
Feb.-Mar.	Develop assessment questions for Stakeholders	ongoing
Feb.-Mar.	Develop stakeholder outreach strategy	ongoing
Feb.-Mar.	PAO and PSB review and approve final stakeholder questions and strategy	ongoing
Mar.	PSB has all relevant data	future
Mar.	Validate PAO data against JIMS data	future
Mar.	Additional data clean up, as needed	future
Mar.	Identify stakeholders, including youth and families who participated in 180	future
Apr.-May	180 Stakeholder outreach	future
Apr.-May	Interview identified 180 youth and families	future
June	Meet with other 180 stakeholders	future
June	Compile stakeholder input	future
June	Review stakeholder input/data	future
July	Pull recidivism data	future
July	Complete first draft of preliminary report	future
July	PAO and PSB meet to discuss first draft of preliminary report	future
Aug.	Identify program benchmarks	future
Aug.	Executive budget briefing	future
Sept.	Finalize assessment report	future
Sept.	Share final report with 180 community board	future
Sept.	Share final report with Dan Satterberg, Dwight Dively, and the King County Council	future
Sept.-Nov.	Present final report to King County Council and other stakeholders and interested parties	future

Estimated Costs

The evaluation will be performed by PSB staff, with support from PAO staff. The total County staff time necessary to complete the report is estimated to cost \$35,000. No other substantial costs are anticipated.

Conclusion

Staff from the Office of Performance, Strategy and Budget (PSB) and the Prosecuting Attorney's Office (PAO) have worked collaboratively to develop a detailed and agreed-upon plan that describes how the assessment of the program's actual impact on delinquent behaviors will be conducted, what data will be relied upon, a timetable for the assessment and an estimate of the cost of the assessment.