



King County

**Task Force on Regional Human Services (TFRHS)
Regional Services to be Provided Through a Countywide Partnership**

**Basic Service Level Qualitative Analysis
8-6-04**

#2 Supportive Relationships within Families, Neighborhoods, Communities		
REGIONAL SERVICES Recommended for a Countywide Partnership	OTHER REGIONAL SERVICES (primarily funded by state and federal governments)	LOCAL SERVICES (funded by local or municipal governments)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Child Care Resource and Referral Services (including training for child care providers) • Early Intervention Programs for At Risk Infants/Children (home visiting, Early Headstart, parent education, advocacy and support services for new young families, teen parents, etc.) • Intervention for High Risk Youth (involved in the criminal justice system and at high risk for reinvolverment) • Legal assistance (civil) • Refugee/Immigrant Services (including language bank/ interpretation services, citizenship classes, training, access and outreach) • Outreach, Information and Referral Assistance to Improve Access to Human Services (Community Information Line, Senior Assistance Line, etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chore services for elderly and disabled • Child care scholarships or subsidies for low-moderate income families • Foster care and group homes for children/youth • Respite care • Early childhood services for developmentally disabled 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programs to support children's home language/culture • Case management to help families and individuals become self-sufficient • Dropout prevention & youth development, e.g. adult mentors/advocates for children/ youth, life skills training, summer & after school programs, service learning opportunities, leadership development • Family involvement in schools; school-based family support & advocacy programs • Outreach, prevention and early intervention for youth and families, including counseling, case management and information & referral • Programs, centers, & intergenerational activities supporting seniors, families • Assistance with community organizing • Prevention of youth involvement with the criminal justice system

The Regional Policy Committee (RPC) Task 2 Report has been the structural basis for the work of the Task Force—the focus has been on the *Regional Services to be Provided through a Countywide Partnership* defined in the report. Throughout Task Force materials, any reference to Regional or a Regional System is a reference to a countywide effort, but not necessarily to King County government. Reference to a region (sometimes called sub-region) within King County (North, East, South, Seattle) is a reference to the geographic area and the people who live there, not necessarily to the jurisdiction(s) located there.

Child Care Resource and Referral Services

Summary of research, best practices, promising practices

- Nurturing, stable and consistent relationships are the key to healthy growth, development and learning, and there are many ways to be a successful parent. Efforts to protect early brain development are best embedded in an overall strategy of general health promotion and disease prevention. This includes attention to the importance of adequate nutrition, the avoidance of harmful exposures, and protection from the stresses of chronic under-stimulation or significant maltreatment.ⁱ
- The basic elements of high-quality child care resemble the qualities of good parenting. Consistent, sensitive, and stimulating care involves the caregiver behavior whether in the home or in child care. When the home environment fails to offer this care, child care environments that do provide it can protect and promote early development. Poor quality child care can compound the consequences of problematic parenting.ⁱⁱ
- Quality of child care is consistently associated with children’s developmental outcomes. When child care is very high-quality, positive effects endure into early adult years, particularly for children from the poorest home environments.ⁱⁱⁱ
- Children who attend high quality child care are more likely to finish school, obtain jobs, stay off welfare, and stay out of the criminal justice system than those who have poor early learning environments. High quality child care is linked to well trained and stable staff, but child care workers typically get low wages and there is high turnover in the field.^{iv}
- Children who regularly attend high-quality after school programs have better school conduct and better grades, better peer relations and emotional adjustment, more academic and enrichment opportunities and lower incidence of drug-use, violence and pregnancy.^v

Prevalence or utilization data

- An estimated 55,200 pre-school children and 71,800 school-aged children regularly attend child care programs in King County. In addition, parents of about 12,300 children aged 0-12 would like to use child care but cannot find suitable care at a price they can afford.^{vi}
- In a 2001 survey, 46% of King County children from birth to age five were in child care on a regularly scheduled basis; of these, 29% were in family, friend or neighbor care (FFN) or in nanny/babysitter care in the child’s home.^{vii} Family income is associated with the type of care children receive. Higher income families are significantly more likely to use center-based care, while children from low-income families are more likely to be in Head Start programs, licensed family child care, or FFN care.^{viii}

- In a 2001 survey, 43% of King County children ages six to twelve were in regularly scheduled child care; of these, 45% were in FFN-type care rather than in a more formal care program.^{ix}
- Of King County parents using child care on a regular basis, 13% said they had to compromise in their choice of care. Of these, the most frequently mentioned reason was cost (34%).^x
- Nearly half of all pre-school children in East Region are in child care; prices are the highest of all the regions in King County.^{xi}
- In 2002, Child Care Resources (CCR) recruitment and retention program responded to 8,363 child care provider technical assistance requests, and assisted 318 new providers through the licensing process. During that same period, they helped 7,502 families find child care.^{xii} Their analyses of supply and demand data for child care concludes that there is a shortage of child care in some areas of the county, particularly for infants, children with special needs, and children who need care during evening and weekend hours.^{xiii}
- The presence of a greater proportion of trained teaching staff is the strongest predictor of whether a child care center sustains quality improvement over time. Stability of the teaching staff is also important for child development. However, attrition among child care workers is 35% statewide, which is directly related to wages. In King County in 2000, child care aides averaged \$7.91/hour, teachers \$9.45/hour, and supervisors \$11.59/hour.^{xiv}
- Public Health—Seattle & King County provides technical assistance to child care providers to ensure physically and emotionally safe and healthy care for children. The agency trains child care workers in basic health and safety knowledge, and provide consultation so all child care centers have written health policies, emergency plans and pesticide policies.^{xv}

Relationship to other goal areas, regional services, local services, other systems

- Countywide, child care rates range from a low of \$340/month for school age care in Seattle to a high of \$968/month in East King County for infant care.^{xvi}
- Government subsidies for child care became more widely available after welfare reform in 1996. However, the state Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS) program made cuts in 2002 and 2003, tightening eligibility rules and implementing higher co-payments. The application process has been centralized through a busy telephone service and is seen as more difficult to access. Child Care Resources reports that the number of callers with DSHS subsidies decreased from 39% in 2001 to 30% in 2002. The State has also reduced funding for recruitment and retention of well trained child care staff.^{xvii}
- As of January 2004, the King County Child Care Program was eliminated and all subsidies through that program discontinued.^{xviii}
- Hopelink's preschool program recently expanded, and all available slots were quickly filled. Bellevue School District's Early Childhood Program has waiting lists. The Head Start program has 108 slots for Bellevue children and there are at least twice that many who are eligible for the program.^{xix} The federal Head Start program still serves only half of all eligible low-income pre-school children nationwide.^{xx}

Local planning initiatives

- Project Lift Off, a community-wide partnership created to increase the quantity, quality, accessibility and affordability of early care and out of school programs for families and children birth to age 18, was launched in 1998 by the City of Seattle. The partnership has grown to include all of King County and has recently merged with the United Way Children's Initiative. Project Lift Off convened a broad cross section of the community to develop a Blueprint for Change. The Blueprint for Change included child care initiatives such as: develop school readiness tools and outreach campaign ([Getting School Ready Project](#)); improve the effectiveness and retention of teachers ([TEACH Program](#)); establish employer champions for accreditation campaign ([Employer Champions for Children Accreditation Project](#)); design/test new approaches to financing high-quality, affordable child care ([Northwest Finance Circle](#)); link increased funding to higher quality ([STEPS to Quality](#)).^{xxi}
- SOAR, formed through the union of Project Lift-Off and the United Way Children's Initiative, is a community partnership to improve the success of children and youth in life and in school. SOAR convened community partners into Family and Child Early Support (FACES) groups in each of the sub-regions. The resulting Early Childhood and School Readiness Action Agenda identified four goals: Nurturing, Prevention/Early Intervention, Early Care and Education, and Successful Transitions. The Action Agenda outlines countywide and sub-regional strategies for each of these four goal areas, with specific action steps for each sub-region.^{xxii}
- Public Health—Seattle & King County summarized the research behind the five important contexts for early childhood development in the Institute of Medicine book *From Neurons to Neighborhoods: The Science of Early Childhood Development*. Meetings of stakeholders countywide in the early childhood arena were convened, resulting in the identification of four broad arenas of public policy: moving families out of poverty; helping parents nurture their children; strengthening our system of child care; and building a comprehensive system of child assessment and care. They set out goals for Nurturing Relationships, Family Resources, Early Care and Education, Neighborhood/Community, and Access to Early Interventions. These are further elaborated in fourteen important policies, and priorities for action.^{xxiii}
- The Seattle Family and Education Levy is governed by the Levy Oversight Committee, which includes the Mayor, City Council President, Seattle Schools Superintendent, School Board representation and two citizen representatives. The task of the group is to establish the policy framework, propose allocations and oversee implementation. The Levy Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) is made up of 43 citizens who represent a broad cross-section of the community and have expertise in the proposed strategic areas of investment. The CAC gathered input from experts, recommended service areas for investment and prioritized service areas for highest impact. The Strategic Areas in the 2004 proposed levy include: Support Early Learning; Focus on Family Involvement and Support; Invest in Out-of-School Time; Help High-Risk Youth; and Support Student Health.^{xxiv}
- South Region plans to increase the availability of quality, affordable, accessible out of school care.^{xxv}
- United Way Eastside Community Council and Child Care Resources have established an emphasis on culturally competent and bilingual child care services.^{xxvi}

Issues identified by presenters to TFRHS

- Low wages/compensation for staff of human services agencies

- Greater need for culturally appropriate child care settings and the consultations, training, and educational materials to support them
- Low pay and high turnover of child care staff increases the need for ongoing training and consultation
- Inability to provide Public Health training and consultation to all child care providers

Examples of current outcome measurements and performance

- 5,500 child care age and 2,500 school age children had improved quality of care.^{xxvii}
- 99% of parents said they received the information they needed to make decisions about child care.^{xxviii}

Recommendations regarding future indicators

Process indicators

- Number of children in childcare, by age and type of child care setting
- Costs of childcare, by age of child, type of facility, location in County
- Supply and demand analysis
- Number of technical assistance calls to providers
- Number of providers assisted in creating new capacity
- Number of parents assisted in selecting child care settings

Outcome indicators

- Satisfaction of parents with assistance in selecting child care; of parents using child care on a regular basis, the percent reporting having to compromise in their choice of care
- Improvements in the supply of child care providers, especially in regard to culture, special needs, infants and after hours care

Early Intervention Programs for At-Risk Infants/Children

Summary of research, best practices, promising practices

- Poverty during a child's early years is especially harmful. Welfare reform experiments suggest that the success of tax and transfer policies affecting family income may hinge on simultaneously linking families and children to early interventions and mental health services. Parents' mental health is important. Punitive parenting, reduced monitoring, parent psychological distress and substance abuse as well as less parental support for children's early learning are all more prevalent in low-income families.^{xxix}

- The combination of family poverty and neighborhood poverty poses a double risk to a substantial number of children. Experimental evidence suggests that moving from high-poverty to low-poverty neighborhoods enhances the physical and psychological health of children and reduces violent crimes committed by adolescents.^{xxx}
- There is considerable evidence that model programs that deliver carefully designed interventions with well-defined goals can affect both parenting behavior and the developmental trajectories of children who are threatened by socioeconomic disadvantage, family disruption, or diagnosed disability. Programs that combine child-focused educational activities with explicit attention to parent-child interaction patterns and relationship-building have the greatest effects.^{xxx}^{xxx}
- There is little empirical documentation that nonspecific, general family support models for high-risk families, which typically are less expensive to deliver, have significant effects on either parent behavior or assessed child performance.^{xxxii}
- There is emerging evidence that child abuse can cause permanent damage to the neural structure and function of the developing brain. Because childhood abuse occurs during a critically formative time, the impact of severe stress can leave an indelible imprint on brain structure and function.^{xxxiii}
- The Olds Model Nurse-Family Partnership provides comprehensive and intensive home visitation during pregnancy and for the first two years after the birth of a first child. The goals are to improve the health and development of both mother and child. Compared to control groups, women in the program had significantly more positive long-term outcomes, including 79% fewer verified reports of child abuse or neglect, 31% fewer subsequent births, 69% fewer maternal arrests and 30 months less receipt of AFDC. The children showed significantly fewer arrests, less running away, and less alcohol consumption by age 15.^{xxxiv}
- Despite the impact demonstrated by early intervention programs for children in high-risk families, no state or city has implemented intensive home visitation services for all high-risk families. The State of Hawaii has come the closest, funding a state Healthy Start home visiting initiative that serves roughly 40% of infants born to high-risk families statewide.^{xxxv}

Prevalence or utilization data

- Birth rates in King County of girls age 15-17 declined from a high of 23.9 per 1,000 in 1992 to 10.9 per 1000 in 2001. The decline has been especially sharp in Seattle. The decline was also reflected in statewide rates.^{xxxvi}
- On average, from 1998-2000, the teen birth rates in South Region and Seattle were higher than in East Region and North Region.^{xxxvii}
- Teen birth rates in areas where more than 20% of the residents live in poverty was nine times higher than the rate in areas where less than 5% of the residents live in poverty.^{xxxviii}
- The infant death rate is the number of deaths of infants under one year of age per 1,000 live births in a given year. Infant death rates have declined since the early 1980s in King County. The five year average rate for 1996-2000 for King County is 5.1, with ranges from 3.2 in the East Region to 5.8 in Seattle. Rates among African-Americans remain higher than the rates for other groups except American Indian/Alaska natives.^{xxxix}

- Between 1999 and 2001, the infant death rate was higher among children born to women less than 20 years old (10.3) than to women older than 20 (4.5).^{xi}
- Current contracted services for intensive home visiting for newborns serves 756 families annually in East, Southeast, and Southwest/Central King County. Intensive home visiting for newborns via Public Health serves 100 families in Renton, Kent and Auburn, and 175 families in Seattle. 22,475 infants were born in King County in 2002. Of these, over 7,000 were Medicaid eligible. On average, there are 1,220 births a year where the mother is under 23. Current home visiting programs are full and have waiting lists.^{xli}
- In the last few years, the Public Health program has seen a decline in demand for service in Seattle and increase in demand in South and Southeast King County.^{xlii}

Relationship to other goal areas, regional services, local services, other systems

- Child abuse is the physical, psychological or sexual mistreatment or physical neglect of children by their parents or guardians. Neglect is the most common form of child abuse. A study cited in the report *Fight Crime: Invest in Kids*, found that individuals who had been abused or neglected as children were 29% more likely to become violent criminals than other children.^{xliii}
- The percent of King County children ages 0-17 in accepted referrals to child protective services has declined from 3.4% of children in 1997 to 2.9% of children in 2001.^{xliv}
- Evidence from national studies suggests that between 40% and 80% of all child abuse and neglect cases involve parental misuse of alcohol and other drugs. Effective early interventions for parental substance abuse can avoid the tremendous costs associated with chronic substance abuse, child abuse and neglect and alternate care for children.^{xlv}

Local planning initiatives

- The King County Children and Family Commission was established in 1992. A 17-member citizen board, it has built partnerships with communities, business, schools, other governments and funders. Projects focus on best and promising programs grounded in research; grantees must leverage other funding sources, report outcomes and commit to an evaluation process. The Commission has supported intensive home visiting since the first pilots were initiated in King County, and has continued to gather data on the effectiveness of these programs.^{xlvi}
- Public Health—Seattle & King County summarized the research behind the five important contexts for early childhood development in the Institute of Medicine book *From Neurons to Neighborhoods: The Science of Early Childhood Development*. Meetings of stakeholders in the early childhood arena were convened, resulting in the identification of four broad arenas of public policy: moving families out of poverty; helping parents nurture their children; strengthening our system of child care; and building a comprehensive system of child assessment and care. These are further elaborated in fourteen important policies, and priorities for action.^{xlvii}
- SOAR, formed through the union of Project Lift-Off and the United Way Children’s Initiative, is a community partnership to improve the success of children and youth in life and in school. SOAR convened community partners into Family and Child Early Support (FACES) groups in each of the sub-regions. The resulting Early Childhood and School Readiness Action Agenda identified four goals: Nurturing, Prevention/Early Intervention, Early Care and Education, and Successful

Transitions. The Action Agenda outlines countywide and sub-regional strategies for each of these four goal areas, with specific action steps for each sub-region.^{xlviii}

- The Seattle Family and Education Levy is governed by the Levy Oversight Committee, which includes the Mayor, City Council President, Seattle Schools Superintendent, School Board representation and two citizen representatives. The Strategic Areas in the 2004 proposed levy include: Support Early Learning; Focus on Family Involvement and Support; Invest in Out-of-School Time; Help High-Risk Youth; and, Support Student Health.^{xlix}

Issues identified by presenters to TFRHS

- Low wages/compensation for staff of human services agencies
- Limited support for parents/families, especially those not from mainstream culture or caring for someone with special needs
- Insufficient capacity for intensive home visiting for all at risk newborns
- Significant disparities in birth outcomes between whites and African-Americans and Native Americans

Examples of current outcome measurements and performance

- The percent of King County children ages 0-17 in accepted referrals to child protective services has declined from 3.4% of children in 1997 to 2.9% of children in 2001.ⁱ
- East/North Health Start provides early intervention programs for parents, age 22 or younger, parenting their first newborn. Of the families served by this program, 94% had no referrals to CPS for abuse or neglect and 99% of the children were current on their immunizations (compared to 86% of the general public). Only 2% of the mothers had second pregnancies compared with a national range of 17-30% for second teen pregnancies.ⁱⁱ

Recommendations regarding future indicators

Process indicators

- Percent of total, Medicaid and under 20 births/year that are served by intensive home visiting
- Total families served

Outcome indicators

- Percent of King County children ages 0-17 in accepted referrals to child protective services
- Percent of families with no domestic violence, child abuse or neglect in the home
- Percent of parents delaying second pregnancy for a minimum of 2 years after the first pregnancy
- Percent of parents linked with a health care provider

Intervention for High Risk Youth

Summary of research, best practices, promising practices

- A comprehensive analysis of research findings in regard to juvenile offenders concluded that behavioral, skill-oriented programs and programs with multiple components produce the largest effects. Deterrent approaches were more likely to produce negative effects. Effective treatment approaches produce larger average treatment effects in a community as opposed to institutional setting. The more effective approaches can reduce recidivism by 10-20%. The amount of treatment was correlated with the intensity of the result.^{lii}
- Multisystemic therapy (MST) is an intensive family and community-based treatment that addresses the multiple determinants of serious antisocial behavior in juvenile offenders. Evaluations of MST have demonstrated reduced long-term rates of criminal offenses, reduced rates of out of home placement, reduced use of alcohol and marijuana, improved family functioning, decreases in mental health problems and cost savings in comparison with usual mental health and juvenile justice services.^{liii} In addition to MST, the other proven programs implemented through the Community Juvenile Accountability Act (CJAA) include Functional Family Therapy (FFT), and Aggression Replacement Training (ART).^{liv}
- The Washington State Institute for Public Policy evaluated these proven programs on behalf of the CJAA and reported these findings: FFT, when delivered competently, reduces felony recidivism by 38% and results in \$10.69 in benefits for each taxpayer dollar spent; ART has positive outcomes with reductions in 18-month felony recidivism of 24% and benefit-to-cost ratio of \$11.66; and, because of problems implementing the evaluation design, no findings were produced regarding MST.^{lv}
- An important finding in many evaluations is the importance of quality implementation. Factors contributing to successful implementation: ample start-up time; clear communication of goals; sufficient, timely and sustained resources; strong leadership; staff development; and use of data to improve performance.^{lvi} The evaluators of CJAA funded programs reported to the Legislature that when the programs do not adhere to the original design they can fail—in fact, poorly delivered programs can increase the recidivism rates of participants. This finding resulted in the recent release of quality control standards for Washington State Juvenile Justice Programs.^{lvii}
- Research on substance abuse treatment for adolescents is an emerging science. However, completion of treatment, including continuing care as an extension of treatment, appears important. In a major evaluation funded by the National Institute on Drug Abuse, completion of treatment was the most consistent predictor of positive outcome. This finding was confirmed in a later study that found better outcomes for those who remained in treatment longer.^{lviii}
- The Search Institute’s research on developmental assets suggests that adults can help increase young people’s internal and external assets by: providing opportunities for bonding; setting clear and consistent boundaries; teaching life skills; providing caring support; setting high expectations, and providing opportunities for meaningful participation.^{lix}

The Search Institute describes a framework of 40 developmental assets, positive factors that all young people need to grow up to be healthy, competent adults. Data analyses show that—across all racial/ethnic groups and different socio-economic situations—young people who experience high levels of developmental assets engage in fewer high-risk behaviors and more thriving behaviors than

young people with few assets. However, on average, 12-18 year old youth experience only 20 or fewer of these developmental assets.^{lx}

Prevalence or utilization data

- The juvenile arrest rate in Washington State continues a downward trend. In King County, the rate for all juvenile arrests in 2001 was 41.2 per 1000, down from a rate of 56.4 in 1996.^{lxi} The reduction in filings from 1998 to 2002 was 46% in King County, compared to 26% statewide, 28% for Pierce and 35% for Snohomish.^{lxii}
- Disproportionate involvement of youth of color is one of the most serious problems facing the juvenile justice system. African-American youth, who make up 8-9% of the general population, still represent 26% of the police referrals to the prosecutor and 40% of youth in secure detention.^{lxiii}
- Most of the youth involved in the juvenile justice system are from Seattle or South King County.^{lxiv}
- The peak hours for juvenile crime are 2:00-8:00 PM; 45% of violent juvenile crimes occur during this time period—triple the rate during other times of the day.^{lxv}

Relationship to other goal areas, regional services, local services, other systems

- King County's public substance abuse treatment system serves 2,400 youth annually; 75% have a history with the juvenile justice system. Of youth profiled in a mental health study, 88% had co-occurring mental health and substance abuse issues.^{lxvi}
- The most common presenting issue precipitating youth homelessness is family conflict. Nationally, it is estimated that 60% of homeless youth have suffered physical or sexual abuse. Of those homeless youth, 21-53% were previously in foster care. A project in Bellevue for homeless youth ages 18-23 provides housing four nights a week, food, clothing, showers and case management. Usually operating at capacity, a number of older youth who use the program have been in the foster care system, which provides services only until they turn eighteen. Youth leaving shelter often have no place to go if they cannot reconcile with their family or find an appropriate foster placement. The Seattle King County Youth Task Force reported that as of July 2000, there was a shortage of 196 beds to meet the estimated need.^{lxvii}
- According to Washington Kids Count, one in three teens experiences problems of substance abuse, depression, violent behavior and poor school performance. Based on demographic data, this means that about 50,000 adolescents in King County are experiencing these problems. The Youth and Family Services system currently is serving about 11,400 of these youth, with another 10,000 being served by the mental health system. This leaves about half of these youth unserved unless they have insurance coverage or the economic ability to purchase services.^{lxviii}
- According to a 2002 study by the Human Services Policy Center, middle and high school students with even moderate involvement with substance use and violence/delinquency had dramatically lower academic achievement than groups with little or no involvement in these behaviors. Little commitment to school appeared to be an important variable in relation to substance use behavior, substance use risk, and violent/delinquent orientation. The study recommends that interventions begin early (6th grade) and focus on groups of students, not just individuals and engage the community, as contrasted with being classroom based.^{lxix}

- The more protective factors youth have in their lives, the less likely they are to use alcohol and drugs; conversely, the more risk factors, the more likely they are to use alcohol and drugs.^{lxx}
- Between 46% and 61% of King County 8th and 10th grade students report having opportunities and being rewarded for their positive involvement in school and community affairs.^{lxxi}
- Between a third and a half of these students reported that they have little commitment to school and low attachment to their neighborhoods.^{lxxii}
- Four South King County school districts are among the 17 statewide that a recent Washington State PTA study says receive less than average funding in comparison with other districts around the state. The at-risk districts of Kent, Renton, Tukwila, and Highline have a higher than average number of students with extraordinary needs such as disabilities, inability to speak English, and poverty. They also have a large number of students with failing scores on the 4th grade mandatory state exam.^{lxxiii}

Local planning initiatives

- The Juvenile Justice Operational Master Plan (JJOMP) is the result of a collaborative effort among community providers, juvenile justice and youth-serving agencies. Cost projections through 2005 included building and operating a new detention facility, as well as increased court and probation costs. Implementation of the JJOMP initiatives has significantly contributed to avoiding juvenile justice costs of \$3.9-5.4 million each year. A hallmark of the JJOMP process has been the collaboration across governments, justice and human services agencies.^{lxxiv}

JJOMP has developed partnerships with other initiatives (described below), pooling staff expertise and funding to accomplish common goals and objectives. In March 2003, the JJOMP Oversight Committee assumed the role of Regional Program Development Unit through a grant from the Governor's Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee. In this role JJOMP will improve coordination across many youth initiatives, sustain the pace of progress, increase information sharing, respond to emergent issues, and support the priorities of the Governor's Committee.^{lxxv}

The shared goals across these partnerships include: cost-effectively prevent/reduce involvement in the juvenile justice system; reduce overrepresentation of youth of color in the juvenile justice system; and ensure youth and families receive effective services for their individual needs. In addition to implementing proven programs and supporting local promising programs through partnerships with community providers, JJOMP is working on how to shift resources "upstream", implement other best practices and complete quality evaluations. The Juvenile Justice Evaluation Work Group, formed by the King County Department of Community and Human Services (DCHS) and JJOMP, has taken the lead on the evaluation effort.^{lxxvi}

- Building Blocks for Youth is a national effort to support local jurisdictions in reducing disproportionate involvement of youth in the juvenile justice system. Seattle/King County was the first site nationally; an advisory committee representing justice agencies, human service organizations and community groups has been moving through the three phases of the project and is now providing oversight to the implementation of recommended changes. JJOMP has multiple initiatives underway focusing on racial disproportionality and cultural competency in the juvenile justice system.^{lxxvii}
- Reinvesting in Youth is a partnership that includes the City of Seattle, Suburban Cities, King County, the Allen Foundation, Gates Foundation, Casey Foundation, Seattle Foundation and community-based providers. The program seeks the realignment of existing programs to demonstrate that the

careful targeting of initial investments toward best practices in intervention and prevention can generate savings in juvenile justice and other deep-end programs. Currently, it is contributing to funding for expansion of proven programs. Another focus is building community capacity by providing technical assistance to agencies in the areas of cultural competency and developing administrative, technical, fiscal and leadership skills that will enhance the agencies' service delivery systems.^{lxxviii}

- A coalition of local jurisdictions has worked together since 1998, pooling their individual allocations of federal funds from the Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant. They coordinate efforts with JJOMP on a broad range of programs; the coalition has funded several JJOMP recommendations.^{lxxix}
- Children and Families In Common is a federal grant managed by DCHS that focuses on the development of a coordinated system of care for children/youth needing mental health services and their families. The partnership includes the juvenile justice system, the state Division of Children and Family Services (the child welfare system), the public mental health and drug and alcohol treatment systems. This project has been providing care coordination and access to treatment services for youth and families presenting at other systems' doors. Funding for this project will terminate in September 2004.^{lxxx}
- Seattle/King County is one of 11 sites funded by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation as part of the Reclaiming Futures initiative. The planning grant brought together 15 core partners including many service providers and youth advocates. A demonstration model will serve 100 substance abusing or dually diagnosed youth and their families per year. The vision includes expansion of the model to all eligible youth on probation.^{lxxxi}
- The King County Children and Family Commission was established in 1992. A 17-member citizen board, it has built partnerships with communities, business, schools, other governments and funders. Projects focus on best and promising programs grounded in research; grantees must leverage other funding sources, report outcomes and commit to an evaluation process. The Commission has funded 5 Safe Communities projects, designed to engage youth, promote individual success, and prevent recidivism or entry into the juvenile justice system.^{lxxxii}
- Project Lift Off sponsored the development of an Action Plan for Inspiring Youth Leadership and Engagement. Its action items included: create community learning centers at key middle schools in King County; expand opportunities for high school aged youth in the evenings and on weekends; create and expand youth employment opportunities; create a youth leadership program similar to Leadership Tomorrow; align out-of-school time with academic standards; and partner with communities to develop services and activities that are specifically tailored for ethnic and immigrant populations.^{lxxxiii}
- The Seattle Family and Education Levy is governed by the Levy Oversight Committee, which includes the Mayor, City Council President, Seattle Schools Superintendent, School Board representation and two citizen representatives. The Strategic Areas in the 2004 proposed levy include: Support Early Learning; Focus on Family Involvement and Support; Invest in Out-of-School Time; Help High-Risk Youth; and Support Student Health.^{lxxxiv}
- The King County Funders' Alliance for Children and Youth was convened within the last year. Participants include United Way, King County (DCHS and Health), City of Seattle (HSD), Bellevue, Shoreline, Allen Foundation, DSHS, Seattle Foundation and the Gates Foundation.

Issues identified by presenters to TFRHS

- Need for more mental health and substance abuse services
- Disproportionate representation of African-American youth in the juvenile justice system and the need for culturally appropriate interventions
- King County, by fall of 2004, will have the capacity to serve only half of the youth on active probation supervision and their families (approximately 800 youth)
- Sufficient programs needed to intervene to prevent involvement in juvenile justice system
- Need for more youth development programs and positive out of school programs
- Limited support for parents/families, especially those not from mainstream culture or caring for someone with special needs
- Schools turning to human services agencies to provides services for families
- Need for before- and after-school programs with academic support
- Low wages for staff of human services agencies

Examples of current outcome measurements and performance

- The number of youth in detention on any given day has declined by 42% since 1998.^{lxxxv}
- Of youth with a criminal history entering the YES Violence Prevention Program, 95% have been successful at not re-offending.^{lxxxvi}
- 75% of Project Royal (community based detention alternative program for African American youth) participants had a reduced number of referrals to juvenile court.^{lxxxvii}
- In 2003, saved 2,303 bed days in detention; 2004 on track to save 4,656 bed days or the equivalent of one 12 bed detention unit.^{lxxxviii}

Recommendations regarding future indicators

Process indicators

- The number of youth in detention on any given day
- The rate of juvenile arrests per 1000
- The percent of youth of color in police arrests and in secure detention

Outcome indicators

- Rate of completion of program services

- Rate of recidivism following program services
- Changes in risk and protective factors based on pre- and post-assessment
- Percent educationally at-risk students that make academic progress
- Percent of youth and/or families acquiring or strengthening coping abilities
- Percent of youth that have learned to incorporate behaviors and skills that foster violence-free interaction
- Percent of overall youth population reporting use of alcohol and drugs
- Percent of overall youth population reporting protective factors in their lives
- Percent of overall youth population reporting risk factors in their lives

Legal Assistance

Summary of research, best practices, promising practices

- The Washington State Supreme Court established a Task Force on Civil Equal Justice in late 2001 to assess the legal needs of low-income residents of the state, determine the degree to which those needs were being addressed, and develop proposals for long-term sustainable funding. The Task Force found that more than 75% of all low-income households in Washington experience at least one civil (not criminal) legal problem each year. Women and children have more legal problems, especially relating to family law and domestic violence. Legal problems experienced by low-income people are more likely to relate to family safety, economic security, housing and other basic needs than those experienced by people with higher incomes. Low-income people who get legal assistance experience better outcomes and have greater respect for the justice system than those who do not.^{lxxxix}
- A recent economic study found that the availability of legal services decreased the likelihood that women would be abused. Helping survivors legally pursue and obtain protection orders, custody, child support and other financial needs gives them the physical safety and financial security that enable them to leave the abuser.^{xc}

Prevalence or utilization data

- Low-income households in King County are most likely to get attorney assistance with their legal problems, compared to other parts of the state, but still face 85% of legal problems on their own. Vulnerable seniors are the most likely among demographic groups to get legal assistance, but only for 22% of the legal problems that they experience. It appears there is a high correlation between lack of awareness of legal resources and the percentage of the population that does not speak English as a primary language in the home.^{xcii}
- Lack of affordable legal services as a household problem increased significantly between 2001 and 2003, according to a phone survey of Bellevue residents. A growing need is for legal services in languages other than English.^{xcii}

- Low cost or free legal services are a critical need for survivors of domestic violence for protection orders, child custody and financial issues.^{xciii}
- Eastside Legal Assistance Program (ELAP) surveyed social service agencies in 2001 and found that the top issues are public housing, child custody, domestic violence, and immigration and naturalization issues. Through its Domestic Violence legal Fund, ELAP provides free emergency representation to low-income domestic violence victims anywhere in King County. In 2002, they were only able to accept referrals for a total of six months; in 2003, they were closed to referrals between January and May. ELAP also instituted a Multi-Ethnic Clinic in 2001, with bilingual staff.^{xciv}
- There are no low cost legal services available in North Region.

Relationship to other goal areas, regional services, local services, other systems

- The Supreme Court Task Force survey suggests that low-income people have legal needs that are most often associated with the issues or services related to other goal areas, regional or local services, and services in other systems.^{xcv}

Local planning initiatives

- The Supreme Court Task Force anticipates that next steps in its process will be an informed discussion of policy, service delivery, and logical funding implications.^{xcvi}

Issues identified by presenters to TFRHS

- Lack of low cost legal services in all regions of King County

Examples of current outcome measurements and performance

- 509 refugees/immigrants were able to obtain legal assistance.^{xcvii}
- 471 victims of domestic violence obtained legal assistance.^{xcviii}
- 76% of clients receiving legal assistance were able to acquire unemployment benefits.^{xcix}

Recommendations regarding future indicators

Process indicators

- Number of people obtaining legal assistance
- Percent of types of issues addressed (see Task Force listing)

Outcome indicators

- Client satisfaction and perception of outcome

Refugee/Immigrant Services

Summary of research best practices, promising practices

- Making Connections, sponsored by the Annie E. Casey Foundation, convened resident groups of refugee and immigrant families in Seattle and White Center to engage them in efforts to strengthen families and neighborhoods. Their most troubling problem was maintaining positive connections between parents and children, and what they wanted and needed was often very different than what was offered them. The study recommended:
 - Extensive learning, listening and inclusion in decision making
 - Supporting and strengthening the ethnic self-help organizations
 - Assisting refugee and immigrant parents to obtain family-supporting wage jobs
 - Supporting traditional culture and language during assimilation, as a critical strategy to maintain positive connections between parents and kids
 - Increasing duration and on-on one attention of ESL classes

Participants in the Making Connections study identified the following gaps and barriers:

- Lack of funding for or recognition of the importance of cultural activities, which are keys to building strengths and preventing problems in families
 - ESL classes mismatched to needs
 - Little assistance in navigating complex systems that even long time residents cannot comprehend; no centralized access to information and resources about all services available
 - Roadblocks to earning higher wages
 - Disrespect for the lives and situations of immigrant and refugee families
 - Being left out of decision-making that affects them^c
- Naturalization services that assist individuals in obtaining citizenship benefit not only the individual but the state. Current federal law limits access for many immigrants to federally funded assistance programs, so most legal immigrants receiving cash, medical or food assistance are supported by state funded programs rather than programs where the federal government contributes to the cost of services. Services include assistance with completion and submittal of the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) application form, payment of INS application and fingerprinting fees, assistance in requesting a waiver to the INS fee, citizenship preparation training and instruction, and English language training needed for the citizenship test.^{ci}
 - The City of Bellevue initiated a Spanish website in October 2003 with essential information about city services and links to other community resources. This is a prototype for websites in other languages in the future.^{cii}

Prevalence or utilization forecasting

- The federal Office of Refugee and Immigrant Assistance estimates the King County refugee population at over 75,000, one of the largest in the US.^{ciii} Washington State ranks 4th in the US in resettling new refugees, receiving between 10,000-15,000 new immigrants and refugees each year. Of these, approximately 10% are elderly.^{civ}
- Since 1990, Washington has seen a major increase in the population claiming Hispanic or Latino origin. In Pierce, King, Thurston and Snohomish counties, the collective increase was 114%.^{cv}
- Approximately 48% of King County's refugees come from Southeast Asia; Eastern Europeans make up more than 34%; and a growing segment is the East African population at 13%. New arrivals tend to locate most heavily in South Region, which in particular is home to a large number of Eastern European refugees.^{cvi}
- Language barriers present a major challenge in ensuring that limited-English speaking populations are aware of and able to access available support.^{cvi}
- At the Eastgate Public Health Clinic, there was a 33% increase in interpreted visits for non-English speaking clients between 2002 and 2003.^{cvi} Between two-thirds and three-quarters of clients are Spanish speaking.^{cix}
- One-quarter of Bellevue residents in 2000 were foreign-born, compared to 13% in 1990. Over half are fairly recent immigrants. Nearly 27% of Bellevue residents speak a language other than English at home.^{cx}
- Of the Shoreline population, 23% is non-Caucasian and nearly 18% speaks a language other than English at home.^{cx}
- In the Bellevue School District, 61 languages other than English are spoken in the schools and parents not speaking English need help to understand the school system and to communicate with teachers.^{cxii} The Seattle School District reports 24% of students speak a language other than English at home.^{cxiii}
- In South Region school districts, more than 80 languages are spoken.^{cxiv} Of the Tukwila population, 26% is foreign born and, in the school district 44% speak English as a second language.^{cxv} In Kent, approximately a third of residents are limited in their English proficiency. Over 70 languages are represented in the Kent School District.^{cxvi}
- Naturalization assistance is funded by DSHS through community based organizations, targeted to immigrants receiving SSI benefits or other cash, medical or food assistance administered by DSHS. It is anticipated that the demand for naturalization services is and will continue to be greater than the state's ability to purchase services. In 2002, 2082 eligible immigrants were served statewide and 528 reported that they became citizens. The process is lengthy and some clients may have to apply more than once before they are successful.^{cxvii}
- Services offered by the Refugee Service Center include bilingual case management services, services for adults (immigration assistance, bilingual counseling, housing assistance, referral services, employment services), services for youth (immigration assistance, bilingual counseling, referral and advocacy services, employment services, diversion services), and the outreach, orientation and advocacy project for refugee re-education detainees from Vietnam.^{cxviii}

Relationship to other goal areas, regional services, local services, other systems

- The need for information and services in languages other than English will grow. Culturally competent and language specific programs will be required in all goal areas.
- ESL instruction is an integral component on the pathway to employment. While adult refugees are being placed in jobs at the most beginning English levels, maintaining a job often takes higher levels of proficiency. Many refugees initially placed in low and non-skilled positions requiring little or no English have lost their positions as the economy has worsened. Current employers are requiring telephone interviews as the first step in the job application process. Limited English prevents a person from performing well on the phone interview, reducing the possibility of employment.^{cxxix}

Local planning initiatives

- The King County Refugee Planning Committee has 30 voting members including representatives from the voluntary resettlement agencies (Volags), community based agencies, educational and governmental organizations, The Refugee Federation Service Center (RFSC) and Mutual Assistance Associations (MAAs) such as:
 - Coalition of Lao Mutual Assistance Associations
 - Indochina Chinese Refugee Association
 - East European Association
 - Khmer Community of Seattle-King County
 - Eritrean Community of Seattle and Vicinity
 - Vietnamese Friendship Association
 - Ethiopian Community Mutual Association
 - Soviet Union Refugee Association
 - Somali Community Services Coalition

The Refugee Federation Service Center (RFSC) serves as a fiscal agent for MAA programs funded through the City of Seattle, King County, Washington State and the Office of Refugee and Immigrant Assistance. In addition, it works closely with the Volags and Neighborhood House low-income housing. The Committee is responsible for the design and implementation of refugee programs in Seattle area.^{cxxx}

- The Eastside Refugee and Immigrant Coalition, started several years ago by YES, United Way, Public Health, City of Bellevue, and City of Kirkland. The Forum focuses on seamless services for immigrants on the eastside, cultural competence training for service providers, and being a resource to the community. Quarterly forums are scheduled on diversity issues and they are producing a resource guide for the newly arrived on the Eastside.^{cxxxi}

Issues identified by presenters to TFRHS

- Limited support for parents/families, especially those not from mainstream culture or caring for someone with special needs
- Inadequate access to information about programs and services, especially in other languages

Examples of current outcome measurements and performance

- 388 people were assisted in gaining citizenship^{cxxii}

- 19 mutual assistance associations strengthened the capacity of their organizations^{cxxiii}

Recommendations regarding future indicators

Process indicators

- Number of new refugees/immigrants annually
- Total number of refugees/immigrants
- Total number/percent of refugees/immigrants served
- Percent of Information and Referral Assistance (I&R) callers served in languages other than English

Outcome indicators

- Percent of adults provided naturalization services that successfully complete the process
- The percent of adults who have specific types of social support (Communities Count)

Outreach, Information and Referral Assistance to Improve Access to Human Services

Summary of research, best practices, promising practices

- During the 2003 legislative session, lawmakers passed a bill making the 2-1-1 code the official number for information about health and human services. This service may be available in King County early in 2005.^{cxxiv} 2-1-1 is an easy to remember telephone number that connects people with important community services and volunteer opportunities. The FCC assigned 2-1-1 for community information and referral nationwide, making this scarce resource available for the sole purpose of community information and referral.^{cxxv}
- While services that are offered through 2-1-1 vary from community to community, 2-1-1 provides callers with information about, and referrals to, human services for everyday needs and in times of crisis. I&R specialists assess callers' needs and determine the service provider best equipped to handle their problems or crises. Additionally, I&R specialists are trained to determine whether a caller may be eligible for other programs. I&R providers maintain comprehensive databases of resources, including federal, state and local government agencies, community-based organizations and private non-profits.^{cxxvi}
- As 2-1-1 Centers have developed in communities, their funding sources vary. Generally, 2-1-1 is funded with money from the United Way, foundations, and federal, state, county and city government funds. Congress has recognized the value of I&R services by authorizing funds under such legislation as the Older Americans Act, the Social Services Block Grant, and The Public Health Security and Bioterrorism Preparedness and Response Act of 2002. The most successful 2-1-1 Centers involve strong public/private partnerships.^{cxxvii}

Prevalence or utilization data

- The Crisis Clinic Community Information Line provides linkage to over 7,000 different community services, handling 71,000 calls in 2002. It provides toll-free lines, TDD lines and bilingual interpretation service via the Language Line. In addition to basic I&R service, Crisis Clinic provides specialized services such as the Caregiver and Disability program, homeless referral service and rental assistance screening. Call management reports indicate that as many as 30,000 calls are unable to be handled because of funding limitations on staffing. It is anticipated that implementation of 2-1-1 service will require capacity to handle up to 140,000 calls.^{cxxviii}
- In a 2003 telephone survey, 45% of Bellevue residents who could not find help for problems reported that it was because they didn't know where to find it.^{cxxix}

Relationship to other goal areas, regional services, local services, other systems

- I&R (website or telephone) services relate to all other goal areas, whether regional, local or managed by other systems, as the mechanism for connecting with those services.

Local planning initiatives

- There is a statewide planning organization for 2-1-1. It is a coalition of local I&R providers and state officials. The Crisis Clinic has been selected as one of two demonstration sites with a goal of implementation in 2004.^{cxxx}

Issues identified by presenters to TFRHS

- Language and cultural needs of refugee and immigrant populations.

Examples of current outcome measurements and performance

- 26,126 people were able to meet basic self-care or other survival needs.^{cxxxi}
- 11,676 people with physical or developmental disabilities are able to live as independently as possible through service access and information.^{cxxxii}
- 77,005 seniors received general information; 9,504 received in-depth assistance to access community services and activities.^{cxxxiii}

Recommendations regarding future indicators

Process indicators

- Total I&R calls
- Total calls by service category requested
- Total calls by language requested
- Total calls by target populations
- Total dropped/abandoned calls

- Average wait time per call

Outcome indicators

- User satisfaction (potential for both website and telephone services)

ⁱ *The Science of Early Childhood Development: A Summary Report of From Neurons to Neighborhoods*. National Research Council, Institute of Medicine. 2000. Prepared by Public Health—Seattle & King County.

ⁱⁱ *The Science of Early Childhood Development: A Summary Report of From Neurons to Neighborhoods*. National Research Council, Institute of Medicine. 2000. Prepared by Public Health—Seattle & King County.

ⁱⁱⁱ *The Science of Early Childhood Development: A Summary Report of From Neurons to Neighborhoods*. National Research Council, Institute of Medicine. 2000. Prepared by Public Health—Seattle & King County.

^{iv} *Human Services Needs Update, 2003-2004*. City of Bellevue, Parks and Community Services Department.

^v *Making Children a National Priority: A Framework for Community Action*. Child Welfare League of America. 2003.

^{vi} *State of Child Care 2002*. Child Care Resources. August 2002.

^{vii} *Communities Count 2002, Social and Health Indicators Across King County*. Public Health—Seattle & King County.

^{viii} *State of Child Care 2002*. Child Care Resources. August 2002.

^{ix} *Communities Count 2002, Social and Health Indicators Across King County*. Public Health—Seattle & King County.

^x *Communities Count 2002, Social and Health Indicators Across King County*. Public Health—Seattle & King County.

^{xi} *Human Services Needs Update, 2003-2004*. City of Bellevue, Parks and Community Services Department.

^{xii} *Quality Child Care Promotes School Readiness*. Child Care Resources. 2002..

^{xiii} *State of Child Care 2002*. Child Care Resources. August 2002.

^{xiv} *State of Child Care 2002*. Child Care Resources. August 2002.

^{xv} Presentation to TFRHS, Public Health-Seattle & King County/King County Children and Family Commission.

^{xvi} *State of Child Care 2002*. Child Care Resources. August 2002.

^{xvii} *Human Services Needs Update, 2003-2004*. City of Bellevue, Parks and Community Services Department.

^{xviii} *Human Services Needs Update, 2003-2004*. City of Bellevue, Parks and Community Services Department.

^{xix} *Human Services Needs Update, 2003-2004*. City of Bellevue, Parks and Community Services Department.

^{xx} Mendel, R. *Less Hype, More Help: Reducing Juvenile Crime, What Works—and What Doesn't*. American Youth Policy Forum. 2000.

-
- ^{xxi} Project Lift Off. www.projectlift-off.org
- ^{xxii} *An Early Childhood and School Readiness Action Agenda*. SOAR, January 2004.
- ^{xxiii} *The Science of Early Childhood Development: A Summary Report of From Neurons to Neighborhoods*. National Research Council, Institute of Medicine. 2000. Prepared by Public Health – Seattle & King County.
- ^{xxiv} The 2004 Families & Education Levy. www.seattle.gov/familiedlevy
- ^{xxv} *Building Health and Human Services in South King County: A Business Plan for Our Community 2003-2005*. South King County Human Services Forum. Presentation, February 2004.
- ^{xxvi} *Human Services Needs Update, 2003-2004*. City of Bellevue, Parks and Community Services Department.
- ^{xxvii} Draft 2003 Regional Services Outcomes Baseline. Seattle Human Services Department. April 2004.
- ^{xxviii} Presentation to TFRHS, King County Department of Community and Human Services.
- ^{xxix} *The Science of Early Childhood Development: A Summary Report of From Neurons to Neighborhoods*. National Research Council, Institute of Medicine. 2000. Prepared by Public Health – Seattle & King County.
- ^{xxx} *The Science of Early Childhood Development: A Summary Report of From Neurons to Neighborhoods*. National Research Council, Institute of Medicine. 2000. Prepared by Public Health – Seattle & King County.
- ^{xxxi} *The Science of Early Childhood Development: A Summary Report of From Neurons to Neighborhoods*. National Research Council, Institute of Medicine. 2000. Prepared by Public Health – Seattle & King County.
- ^{xxxii} *The Science of Early Childhood Development: A Summary Report of From Neurons to Neighborhoods*. National Research Council, Institute of Medicine. 2000. Prepared by Public Health – Seattle & King County.
- ^{xxxiii} Teicher, M. *Scars that Won't Heal: the Neurobiology of Child Abuse*. Scientific American. March 2002.
- ^{xxxiv} *Making Children a National Priority: A Framework for Community Action*. Child Welfare League of America. 2003.
- ^{xxxv} Mendel, R. *Less Hype, More Help: Reducing Juvenile Crime, What Works—and What Doesn't*. American Youth Policy Forum. 2000.
- ^{xxxvi} *Communities Count 2002, Social and Health Indicators Across King County*. Public Health—Seattle & King County.
- ^{xxxvii} *Communities Count 2002, Social and Health Indicators Across King County*. Public Health—Seattle & King County.
- ^{xxxviii} *Communities Count 2002, Social and Health Indicators Across King County*. Public Health—Seattle & King County.
- ^{xxxix} *Communities Count 2002, Social and Health Indicators Across King County*. Public Health—Seattle & King County.
- ^{xl} *Communities Count 2002, Social and Health Indicators Across King County*. Public Health—Seattle & King County.
- ^{xli} Presentation to TFRHS, Public Health-Seattle & King County/King County Children and Family Commission.

-
- xlii Presentation to TFRHS, Public Health—Seattle & King County/King County Children and Family Commission.
- xliii *Human Services Needs Update, 2003-2004*. City of Bellevue, Parks and Community Services Department.
- xliv *Communities Count 2002, Social and Health Indicators Across King County*. Public Health—Seattle & King County.
- xlv *Making Children a National Priority: A Framework for Community Action*. Child Welfare League of America. 2003.
- xlvi Presentation to TFRHS, Public Health—Seattle & King County/King County Children and Family Commission.
- xlvii *The Science of Early Childhood Development: A Summary Report of From Neurons to Neighborhoods*. National Research Council, Institute of Medicine. 2000. Prepared by Public Health – Seattle & King County.
- xlviii *An Early Childhood and School Readiness Action Agenda*. SOAR, January 2004.
- xlx The 2004 Families & Education Levy. www.seattle.gov/familiesedlevy
- ¹ *Communities Count 2002, Social and Health Indicators Across King County*. Public Health—Seattle & King County.
- ^{li} *Human Services Needs Update, 2003-2004*. City of Bellevue, Parks and Community Services Department.
- ^{lii} Lieb, R. *Juvenile Offenders: What Works? A Summary of Research Findings*. Washington State Institute for Public Policy. October 1994.
- ^{liii} *Making Children a National Priority: A Framework for Community Action*. Child Welfare League of America. 2003.
- ^{liv} Juvenile Justice Operational Master Plan. Annual Report 2003.
- ^{lv} *Outcome Evaluation of Washington State’s Research-Based Programs for Juvenile Offenders*. Washington State Institute for Public Policy. January 2004.
- ^{lvi} *Some Things Do Make a Difference for Youth*. American Youth Policy Forum. 1997.
- ^{lvii} *Recommended Quality Control Standards: Washington State Research-Based Juvenile Offender Programs*. Washington State Institute for Public Policy. December 2003.
- ^{lviii} *Treating Teens: a Guide to Adolescent Drug Programs*. Drug Strategies. 2003.
- ^{lix} *Developmental Assets: An Overview*. The Search Institute. 2002. www.search-institute.org
- ^{lx} *Unique Strengths, Shared Strengths: Developmental Assets Among Youth of Color*. Search Institute Insights & Evidence. November 2003.
- ^{lxi} *Human Services Needs Update, 2003-2004*. City of Bellevue, Parks and Community Services Department.
- ^{lxii} Juvenile Justice Operational Master Plan. Annual Report 2003.
- ^{lxiii} Juvenile Justice Operational Master Plan. Annual Report 2003.
- ^{lxiv} Presentation to TFRHS, King County Department of Community and Human Services.
- ^{lxv} Presentation to TFRHS, South King County Human Services Forum.

-
- lxvi Presentation to TFRHS, King County Department of Community and Human Services.
- lxvii *Human Services Needs Update, 2003-2004*. City of Bellevue, Parks and Community Services Department.
- lxviii Presentation to TFRHS, King County Alliance for Human Services.
- lxix lxix Mandell, D., et al. *The Impact of substance Use and Violence/Delinquency on Academic Achievement for Groups of Middle and High School Students in Washington*. Human Services Policy Center. May 2002.
- lxx *Communities Count 2002, Social and Health Indicators Across King County*. Public Health—Seattle & King County.
- lxxi *Communities Count 2002, Social and Health Indicators Across King County*. Public Health—Seattle & King County.
- lxxii *Communities Count 2002, Social and Health Indicators Across King County*. Public Health—Seattle & King County.
- lxxiii *PTA Calls 4 School Districts “At Risk”*. King County Journal. April 29, 2004.
- lxxiv Presentation to TFRHS, King County Superior Court-Juvenile Court Services.
- lxxv Juvenile Justice Operational Master Plan. Annual Report 2003.
- lxxvi Juvenile Justice Operational Master Plan. Annual Report 2003.
- lxxvii Juvenile Justice Operational Master Plan. Annual Report 2003.
- lxxviii Juvenile Justice Operational Master Plan. Annual Report 2003.
- lxxix Juvenile Justice Operational Master Plan. Annual Report 2003.
- lxxx Juvenile Justice Operational Master Plan. Annual Report 2003.
- lxxxi Juvenile Justice Operational Master Plan. Annual Report 2003.
- lxxxii Presentation to TFRHS, Public Health-Seattle & King County/King County Children and Family Commission.
- lxxxiii *Inspiring Youth Leadership and Engagement: An Action Plan*. Project Lift Off. November 2001.
- lxxxiv The 2004 Families & Education Levy. www.seattle.gov/familiedlevy
- lxxxv Presentation to TFRHS, King County Superior Court-Juvenile Court Services.
- lxxxvi *Human Services Needs Update, 2003-2004*. City of Bellevue, Parks and Community Services Department.
- lxxxvii Presentation to TFRHS, King County Department of Community and Human Services.
- lxxxviii Presentation to TFRHS, King County Superior Court-Juvenile Court Services
- lxxxix *The Washington State Civil Legal Needs Study*. Task Force on Civil Equal Justice Funding, Washington State Supreme Court. September 2003.
- xc *Human Services Needs Update, 2003-2004*. City of Bellevue, Parks and Community Services Department.

-
- ^{xc}i *The Washington State Civil Legal Needs Study*. Task Force on Civil Equal Justice Funding, Washington State Supreme Court. September 2003.
- ^{xc}ii *Human Services Needs Update, 2003-2004*. City of Bellevue, Parks and Community Services Department.
- ^{xc}iii *Human Services Needs Update, 2003-2004*. City of Bellevue, Parks and Community Services Department.
- ^{xc}iv *Human Services Needs Update, 2003-2004*. City of Bellevue, Parks and Community Services Department.
- ^{xc}v *The Washington State Civil Legal Needs Study*. Task Force on Civil Equal Justice Funding, Washington State Supreme Court. September 2003.
- ^{xc}vi *The Washington State Civil Legal Needs Study*. Task Force on Civil Equal Justice Funding, Washington State Supreme Court. September 2003.
- ^{xc}vii *Draft 2003 Regional Services Outcomes Baseline*. Seattle Human Services Department. April 2004.
- ^{xc}viii *Draft 2003 Regional Services Outcomes Baseline*. Seattle Human Services Department. April 2004.
- ^{xc}ix Presentation to TFRHS, King County Department of Community and Human Services.
- ^c *Forgotten Voices, Untold Stories*. Seattle/King County Making Connections. Annie E. Casey Foundation. April 2001.
- ^{ci} Report to the Legislature. Naturalization Facilitation. DSHS, December 20
- ^{cii} *Human Services Needs Update, 2003-2004*. City of Bellevue, Parks and Community Services Department.
- ^{ciii} *Human Services Needs Update, 2003-2004*. City of Bellevue, Parks and Community Services Department.
- ^{civ} Report to the Legislature. Naturalization Facilitation. DSHS, December 2002.
- ^{cv} *Human Services Needs Update, 2003-2004*. City of Bellevue, Parks and Community Services Department.
- ^{cvi} *Refugee Service Delivery Plan; King, Pierce, and Snohomish Counties*. King County Refugee Planning Committee. FY 2003.
- ^{cvi} *Human Services Needs Update, 2003-2004*. City of Bellevue, Parks and Community Services Department.
- ^{cvi} *Human Services Needs Update, 2003-2004*. City of Bellevue, Parks and Community Services Department.
- ^{cix} Presentation to TFRHS, Eastside Human Services Forum.
- ^{cx} *Human Services Needs Update, 2003-2004*. City of Bellevue, Parks and Community Services Department.
- ^{cx}i Presentation to TFRHS, North King County.
- ^{cx}ii *Human Services Needs Update, 2003-2004*. City of Bellevue, Parks and Community Services Department.
- ^{cx}iii *Refugee Service Delivery Plan; King, Pierce, and Snohomish Counties*. King County Refugee Planning Committee. FY 2003.
- ^{cx}iv *Building Health and Human Services in South King County: A Business Plan for Our Community 2003-2005*. South King County Human Services Forum. Presentation, February 2004.
- ^{cx}v Presentation to TFRHS, South King Council of Human Services.
- ^{cx}vi Presentation to TFRHS, South King Council of Human Services.

-
- ^{cxvii} Report to the Legislature. Naturalization Facilitation. DSHS, December 2002
- ^{cxviii} Refugee Federation Service Center. www.rfsc.org
- ^{cxix} *Refugee Service Delivery Plan; King, Pierce, and Snohomish Counties*. King County Refugee Planning Committee. FY 2003.
- ^{cxx} Refugee Federation Service Center. www.rfsc.org
- ^{cxixi} Communication from Sadikifu Akina-James.
- ^{cxixii} *Draft 2003 Regional Services Outcomes Baseline*. Seattle Human Services Department. April 2004.
- ^{cxixiii} *Draft 2003 Regional Services Outcomes Baseline*. Seattle Human Services Department. April 2004.
- ^{cxixiv} *Human Services Needs Update, 2003-2004*. City of Bellevue, Parks and Community Services Department
- ^{cxixv} www.211.org
- ^{cxixvi} www.211.org
- ^{cxixvii} www.211.org
- ^{cxixviii} Presentation to DCHS Community Services Division. Crisis Clinic.
- ^{cxixix} *Human Services Needs Update, 2003-2004*. City of Bellevue, Parks and Community Services Department
- ^{cxixxx} Presentation to DCHS Community Services Division. Crisis Clinic.
- ^{cxixxxi} *Draft 2003 Regional Services Outcomes Baseline*. Seattle Human Services Department. April 2004.
- ^{cxixxxii} *Draft 2003 Regional Services Outcomes Baseline*. Seattle Human Services Department. April 2004.
- ^{cxixxxiii} *Draft 2003 Regional Services Outcomes Baseline*. Seattle Human Services Department. April 2004.