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Preface: About this Document

This document is part of the technical assistance package provided by the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) Office of Justice Programs (OJP) Diagnostic Center in response to a request for assistance from the City of Seattle, Office of City Auditor.

Through services provided across OJP’s many programs, the Diagnostic Center aims to fulfill a nationwide call from the criminal justice community to improve access to information on what works in preventing and controlling crime, as well as provide guidance on how to implement data-driven programming. Diagnostic Center services are customized for each community’s crime problem.

The purpose of this document is to:

- **Identify and analyze factors** that contribute to the issues identified in the request from the City of Seattle, Office of City Auditor.

- **Recommend evidence- or practice-based solutions and promising practices** that address the contributing factors. The community is responsible for evaluating and selecting the practices they deem the best fit to implement in their community.

- **Inform development of a response strategy**, in close coordination with the requesting community leaders, for implementing the recommended evidence-based solutions.

Note: Information contained in this Diagnostic Analysis is based on information collected prior to March 2015.
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The Office of City Auditor has requested assistance in determining the nature and extent of juvenile domestic violence in Seattle

Overview of the TTA Request from the City of Seattle, Office of City Auditor

- While reviewing the Seattle Youth Violence Prevention Initiative (SYVPI) in 2013, the Office of City Auditor discovered that juvenile domestic violence (JDV) accounts for a significant share of Seattle’s juvenile violent crime arrests between 2008 and 2012

- Seattle’s Office of City Auditor convened a multidisciplinary core team comprised of local law enforcement, juvenile justice (JJ) agencies, service providers and research partners to address JDV issues in the City of Seattle

- The Seattle Core Team (SCT) seeks technical assistance to determine the nature and extent of JDV in the City of Seattle and to assess and improve the City’s capacity to address JDV through public services, both within and outside the JJ system

Seattle Core Team Agencies*

*Graphics are not intended to represent an exhaustive list of all core team member agencies

Per the preface disclaimer, points of view or opinions in this document do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice
In concert with the SCT, the Diagnostic Center identified the following areas of support in fulfillment of the TTA request:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intended Outcome</th>
<th>Support Area 1</th>
<th>Support Area 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify promising practices to reduce JDV, evaluate their applicability to Seattle’s context and determine how to implement them most effectively across local stakeholder groups</td>
<td>JDV Data Assessment</td>
<td>Gap Analysis of Existing JDV-related Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Support Area 1: JDV Data Assessment

**Activities**

- Perform baseline data collection to determine the nature and extent of JDV
- Identify primary and underlying factors contributing to JDV
- Recommend methodologies to improve data collection, analysis and information-sharing across the juvenile justice system

**Outputs**

- Baseline indicators
- Data collection and information-sharing plan
- Data-driven action plan to reduce JDV
- Diagnostic Analysis
- Training and technical assistance (to be determined)

### Support Area 2: Gap Analysis of Existing JDV-related Services

**Activities**

- Examine juvenile justice system response to JDV, including current intervention strategies
- Identify available JDV-related, community-based resources
- Evaluate the capacity and effectiveness of existing resources to address JDV
- Identify promising practices, resources and prevention measures to enhance systemwide JDV responses

**Outputs**

- Gap analysis
- Multi-disciplinary response strategy
- Performance-based measures
- Resource recommendations
- Peer-to-peer mentoring

The Diagnostic Center will work with the Office of City Auditor and community stakeholders to identify indicators that can be tracked over time to show progress toward intended outcomes.

---

Per the preface disclaimer, points of view or opinions in this document do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.
The OJP Diagnostic Center’s defining characteristic is its data-driven approach to tackling persistent crime and public safety challenges.

Over the course of several months, the Diagnostic Center staff worked with the Office of City Auditor and other local stakeholders to “diagnose” the City of Seattle’s JDV-related crime problems and identify best fit solutions.

To ensure a comprehensive solution is developed, the Diagnostic Center analyzed the criminogenic factors that are most relevant to the request.

The Diagnostic Center’s data-driven approach to diagnosing the crime issue and mapping it to customized models will maximize the investment made by the City of Seattle and its Office of City Auditor to effect meaningful change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>Diagnose</th>
<th>Implement</th>
<th>Assess</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Identify the need for an intervention</td>
<td>2.1 Understand what makes a program practice- or evidence-based</td>
<td>3.1 Determine necessary program adaptations (if needed)</td>
<td>4.1 Develop an evaluation strategy and tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Generate initial hypotheses on criminogenic contributing factors</td>
<td>2.2 Identify practice- or evidence-based program options</td>
<td>3.2 Develop program implementation and sustainability plans</td>
<td>4.2 Implement evaluation strategy and collect data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Identify and interview stakeholders</td>
<td>2.3 Evaluate and select the “best fit” practice- or evidence-based model</td>
<td>3.3 Build or engage community coalitions</td>
<td>4.3 Conduct periodic reviews of evaluation results and program fidelity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Collect and synthesize data to identify baseline indicators</td>
<td>2.4 Assess community and organizational readiness</td>
<td>3.4 Begin implementation and training activities</td>
<td>4.4 Share success stories and lessons learned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Refine hypotheses and prioritize criminogenic contributing factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outputs:

- Problem definition and scope
- List of contributing factors and baseline indicators
- Hypotheses for how each factor contributes to the problem

Impacts:

- Understanding and data-driven diagnosis of problem
- Identification of “best fit” practice- or evidence-based model(s) and program design
- Delivery of interventions to target population
- Evaluation results, lessons learned, best practices, and measurement of change against baseline indicators

- Selection of “best fit” practice- or evidence-based model
- Best practices on how to implement the model
- Increased staff skills
- Documentation of program accountability and integrity

- Successful implementation of practice- or evidence-based programs and practices, with fidelity and integrity
- More efficient and effective criminal justice system
- Recommendations for future program modifications and improvements

- Immediate improvement in mission area
- Reduction or elimination of criminal justice problem
- Results that inform future management and funding decisions

Per the preface disclaimer, points of view or opinions in this document do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.
The OJP Diagnostic Center conducted in-depth interviews with the SCT to define the scope of JDV within the City of Seattle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviews Conducted to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Juvenile Justice System Component**

- **Municipal Representatives**
  - City of Seattle, Office of City Auditor

- **Law Enforcement**
  - Seattle Police Department
  - Shoreline Police Department
  - King County Sheriff’s Office
  - King County Prosecutor’s Office
  - King County Juvenile Courts (Probation Services)

- **Provider Services**
  - King County Step-Up Program
  - Washington State Department of Social and Health Services
  - Children’s Administration

- **Research Partners**
  - Washington State Center for Court Research
  - University of Washington School of Medicine, Department of Psychiatry & Behavioral Science
  - George Mason University, Center for Evidence-based Crime Policy

Per the preface disclaimer, points of view or opinions in this document do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.
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Legal statutes define the parameters for the nature and scope of juvenile domestic violence

### Scoping the Issue:
- Washington RCW § 26.50.010 defines “domestic violence” (DV) as:
  1. physical harm, bodily injury, assault, or the infliction of fear of imminent physical harm, bodily injury or assault, between family or household members;
  2. sexual assault of one family or household member by another; or
  3. stalking as defined of one family or household member by another family or household member

- "Family or household members" means spouses, domestic partners, former spouses, former domestic partners, persons who have a child in common regardless of whether they have been married or have lived together at any time, adult persons related by blood or marriage, adult persons who are presently residing together or who have resided together in the past, persons sixteen years of age or older who are presently residing together or who have resided together in the past, persons sixteen years of age or older who have or have not had a dating relationship, persons sixteen years of age or older with whom a person sixteen years of age or older has or has not had a dating relationship, and persons who have a biological or legal parent-child relationship, including stepparents and stepchildren and grandparents and grandchildren

### Relationship Types

#### "Dating relationship" means a social relationship of a romantic nature. Factors that the court may consider in making this determination include:

- the length of time the relationship has existed;
- the nature of the relationship; and
- the frequency of interaction between the parties

### Implications

The existing legal framework enhances the ability of Seattle’s criminal justice (CJ) agencies to define and respond to instances of juvenile domestic violence by:

- Establishing definitions of domestic violence and clearly delineating types of offender/victim relationships to facilitate the identification of JDV and inform law enforcement and CJ responses to incidents
- Creating a systemwide approach that recognizes the complexities of family-based violence and circumstances that contribute to JDV issues within the household
- Identifying responsible agencies to develop coordinated response strategies that include prevention and intervention to support juvenile offenders and family members and reduce the likelihood to reoffend
JDV is a complex phenomenon that requires coordinated responses across various JJ agencies

Statistics provided by the Office of City Auditor demonstrate increases in DV-related juvenile violent crime arrests over a five-year period

- DV as a percentage of total juvenile violent crime arrests increased more than two-fold between 2008 to 2012. In 2012, over one-third of all juvenile violent crime arrests were for DV
- It is important to note the distinction between juvenile batterers of intimate partners and juveniles who assault and/or threaten parents, caregivers or other family/household members
  - According to feedback received from the King County Prosecutor, 13% of 2012 juvenile DV cases were considered teen dating violence; the remaining 87% were cases involving violence against family members

While Washington State defines domestic violence in the penal code, the way the data is collected varies across organizations

- The Seattle Police Department (SPD) collects DV-related data through calls for service (documented in CAD) and as a crime or arrest report (RMS)
  - Calls for service do not have offender information; juvenile-related calls cannot be determined
  - Crime incident reports include victim and offender information (listed either as a suspect or if arrested, that is designated). While the state has a mandatory arrest policy for juveniles ages 16 & 17, if a crime is not evident or if the suspect is not on-scene, an arrest may not be made
  - Both CAD and RMS systems include a DV check-box as well as other offense descriptions specifically designating “DV”
- Arrests are then referred to the King County Prosecutor’s Office, which decides, for each charge whether it will be filed (prosecuted), receive diversion or be rejected. Prosecution data includes a DV designator as well
- JDV offenders who are diverted or convicted may be referred to the King County’s Step-Up Program, a family violence intervention program

Source: Office of City Auditor, City of Seattle
Per the preface disclaimer, points of view or opinions in this document do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice
Family-based violence constitutes the vast majority domestic violence-related incidents involving juveniles

Following the legal parameters established by the domestic violence statute, the Diagnostic Analysis focuses on JDV crimes where the victim-offender relationships were identified as family or household members. Additionally, in-depth interviews identified this relationship type as the area of most critical need for this assessment.

- Between 2011-2013, 873 of the total 984 JDV incidents were family-based; the following analysis focuses on those 873 incidents for family-based JDV only.
- Peak times for JDV-related incidents are after school and into the evening; nearly half of all incidents (45%) occur between 4 pm and 10 pm. Time of day patterns demonstrate little variance between weekdays and weekends. However, there are nearly 40% more incidents on weekend days than weekdays.
- The large majority (90%) of incidents were reported the same day they occurred; potentially representing a tipping point as there tends to be a long history of unreported violent behavior prior to law enforcement involvement.
- Despite available data, SCT interviews suggest that JDV crimes are severely underreported as:
  - Victims – most often parents or caregivers – are at times blamed for the child’s aggressive behavior; this criminalization of the victim reduces the likelihood of victims’ willingness to seek help.
  - Victims can also be uncooperative and/or reluctant to involve law enforcement to avoid subjecting their child to formal criminal charges and proceedings.

### Days to Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days to Report</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same day</td>
<td>794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-6 days</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 weeks</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4 weeks</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 1 month</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Incidents by Time of Day: Weekday vs. Weekend

- Average Number per Day
- Source: Seattle Police Department

Per the preface disclaimer, points of view or opinions in this document do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.
JDV incidents are primarily assaults using hands, feet or other part of the person

Summary:

- 62% of the incidents were assaults (aggravated or non-aggravated)
- While one-third of the incidents did not have a weapon listed, of the incidents with a weapon, 75% were a personal weapon such as hands, feet, teeth, etc.
- Most incidents had only 1 weapon, but 51 incidents had 2 weapons and 2 incidents had 3 weapons
- Only one incident included the use of a gun and 40 incidents with a knife or other cutting instrument. Therefore, responses do not need to focus too many resources on incidents involving serious weapons offenses

Incidents by Crime Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime Type</th>
<th>Incidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-aggravated Assault</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property-based Crimes</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disturbance</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment &amp; Threats</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Incidents by Weapon Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weapon Type</th>
<th>Incidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Weapon*</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Weapon**</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knife/Cutting Instrument</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blunt Object</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphyxiation</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shotgun</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Total weapons add up to more than total incidents with weapons due to multiple weapons for single incidents

Source: Seattle Police Department

*Personal weapon includes hands, feet, teeth, etc.
**Other weapons include vehicle, incendiary device, etc.
JDV incidents are primarily concentrated in North and South Seattle

The top ten census tracts had more than 20 incidents, which account for 35% of total incidents

- The highest JDV tracts were largely in low income, minority neighborhoods. The citywide average for juveniles as a percent of population is 21%, several of these tracts were well above average
- Additional analysis of the high-occurring census tracts should be completed to identify any schools, housing complexes, community assets/resources and any unique challenges
- Interventions and strategies should be targeted to the small number of census tracts and police districts where a large percentage of the incidents are occurring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRACT</th>
<th>JDV</th>
<th>POP.</th>
<th>MED. INC.</th>
<th>AVG AGE</th>
<th>% POP &lt;18</th>
<th>% NON-WHITE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tract 1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6282</td>
<td>$40,313</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 118</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7842</td>
<td>$34,745</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 107.02</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3690</td>
<td>$40,625</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 108</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4706</td>
<td>$69,468</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 119</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7494</td>
<td>$68,846</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 112</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4745</td>
<td>$43,295</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 113</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6234</td>
<td>$53,182</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 111.01</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4711</td>
<td>$51,823</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 101</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5814</td>
<td>$57,750</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract 110.01</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4676</td>
<td>$27,292</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Seattle Police Department

Per the preface disclaimer, points of view or opinions in this document do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice
One third of all JDV-related incidents occur in two police districts of South Seattle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Police District</th>
<th>Suspect (%)</th>
<th>Arrest (%)</th>
<th>Total Offenders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two of the 17 police districts constitute approximately one third (31%) of all JDV incidents

Source: Seattle Police Department

Per the preface disclaimer, points of view or opinions in this document do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice
Forty-eight percent of JDV victims are white and tend to be a female parent between the ages 30-59

Between 2011 and 2013 there were 614* different victims for 793 incidents

- Sixteen percent of the victims had 2 or more incidents, accounting for 35% of the total; with nine victims involved in five or more incidents
- Almost two-thirds (65%) of victims were a parent. The disparity between male and female victims, 30 years or older is due to the increased likelihood of female parent as victim of assault and female parent in single-parent household
- About two-thirds (66%) of victims were 30-59 years old and nearly half (48%) were noted as white by responding officer
- Younger victims are typically siblings of the offender

### Victim Relationship to Offender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship to Offender</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent/Step-Parent</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibling/Step-Sibling</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Family Member</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandparent</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child/Stepchild/Grandchild</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquaintance/Friend/Neighbor</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stranger</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child of Boyfriend/Girlfriend</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyfriend/Girlfriend</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL RELATIONSHIP KNOWN</td>
<td>764</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Victim Profile

- **FEMALE**
- **MALE**

![Graph showing distribution of victims by age and race]

**NOTES:**

1. Race is determined by responding officer for persons involved; officer discretion may lead to inconsistent data captured for this field
2. Hispanic/Latino is not included as an option in the SPD RMS; officer may categorize this population as white, unknown or any other racial category available in data systems

*Number of victims include only victims identified for a single incident; victim may have been involved in multiple incidents; unidentified victims are excluded in the analysis

**Non-family member relationships were included due to multiple offenders or multiple victims with one being family

Source: Seattle Police Department

Per the preface disclaimer, points of view or opinions in this document do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.
Between 2011-2013, SPD reported 892 suspects or arrests for 873 JDV-related incidents

The total number of juvenile offenders increased slightly between 2011 and 2012, but decreased below 2011 levels in 2013

- The percentage of juveniles arrested from year-to-year held steady, ranging from 65% to 70%
- Of the 892 suspects/arrests,* there were 598 different offenders; ranging from 1 incident to 12 incidents per offender
  - The juvenile with the most offenses (12) was a suspect in 5 incidents and arrested 7 times
  - Large number of repeats offenses (150 offenders; 25% had 2 or more incidents) accounted for 51% of the total incidents
- Eight offenders had 6 or more incidents (suspect or arrest) with most being older; incidents occurred within 1 year or over consecutive years
- Strategies and interventions should focus on frequent, repeat offenders to significantly affect the overall problem. Additional interventions should focus on the first-time offenders at a younger age to reduce the number of repeat incidents as they age

*Multiple suspects/arrests for some offenders and/or for some incidents

Source: Seattle Police Department

Per the preface disclaimer, points of view or opinions in this document do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice
Forty-five percent of suspects/arrestees are white and 80% are between the ages of 15 and 17

Offenders by Race*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/ African-American</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Offenders by Age & Incident Outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Suspect</th>
<th>Arrest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary:
- While black/African-Americans comprise 36% of victims, this demographic comprises 43% of offenders.
- White JDV offenders constitute 47% of offenders, roughly equal to the percentage of white victims (48%) for this three-year period.
- Race is determined by responding officer; other categorizations, such as Hispanic/Latino, East African, etc. are not captured in current RMS data systems and may be included in existing racial categories available in data system.
- Substantial increases in arrest at ages 15-17 can be attributed to local mandatory arrest laws and repeat offenses as a juvenile offender ages.

*Race is not captured consistently; data may include duplicates where for some incidents race of single offender is noted differently for separate incidents.

Source: Seattle Police Department

Per the preface disclaimer, points of view or opinions in this document do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.
Between 2011 and 2013, SPD referred approximately 80% of arrestees; about half were prosecuted

Summary:
- Of the 599 SPD arrests, 488 were referred to the District Attorney (DA) by SPD, involving 363 different juveniles. Over half of these cases (56%) were rejected or the DA declined to file charges.
- Of the 363 different juveniles referred; 78 of them had 2 or more referrals, including 4 individuals with 5 or more referrals.
  - Similar to the repeat suspect/arrestees, interventions should focus on the juveniles who have been repeatedly referred.
- The predominant charge was assault, with harassment being the next most common.
- In order to create the most effective strategies surrounding prosecution, further analysis should be conducted around reasons cases are rejected and/or diverted.

Note: Family violence was determined by linking SPD case number; additional referrals did not match for a variety of reasons and were excluded in this analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referral Disposition</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diversion</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filed*</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If at least 1 charge was filed, the case was counted as filed.

Charge by Type

- Assault: 79%
- Harassment: 12%
- Malicious Mischief: 8%
- Theft: 1%

Source: Seattle Police Department and King County Prosecuting Attorney’s Office

Per the preface disclaimer, points of view or opinions in this document do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.
Most JDV offenders referred to prosecution were 15-17 years old and 40% were black/African-American

Of the 488 referrals, only 26 had sentencing information included; which is too small of a sample size to conduct analysis on sentencing

- 73 cases have two or more counts/offenses
- As offenders get older, the number of cases referred to prosecution rises until age 16 and then falls again at 17
- Most juveniles referred to prosecution were black/African-American with white being the next most common. East Africans were the only population where there were more females (twice as many) than males
- Even though the majority of incidents reported by SPD and referred to prosecution are committed by white offenders, when looking at referral outcomes, races are all relatively equal
  - Racial/ethnic identifiers in data capture fields lack the specificity needed to appropriately determine instances of disproportionate minority contact
  - Disparities cannot be accurately quantified due to inconsistent data capture fields between law enforcement and JJ agencies

Source: King County Prosecuting Attorney’s Office
The Step-Up program provides additional information on juvenile offenders who have had JDV-related family problems

“Step-Up: Building Respectful Family Relationships” is a family violence intervention program serving approximately 25 youth and families per year throughout King County

- Step-Up offers a 21-session weekly program for youth and their families grappling with JDV problems. Services are provided in two locations within King County (but outside the City of Seattle). Fiscal and capacity constraints limit the program’s ability to effectively meet critical community needs.

- Clients are referred in a variety of ways. During 2011-2013, for the City of Seattle, referrals came from Court mandated diversion (37%); Juvenile Probation/Judge/Court (24%); self referral (24%); other agency (12%); and Victim Assistance Unit (3%).

- The juvenile’s “legal status” (affiliation with the juvenile justice system) is split relatively evenly between being on probation, being in a diversion program or no court programming, which could indicate a self-initiated referral.

Client Demographics (N=33*)

- Female 39%
- Male 61%

Legal Status

- No Court 30%
- Diversion 43%
- Probation 27%

*Denotes total sample size of data provided

Source: Step-Up Program

According to intake forms, parents indicate that 51% of clients’ behavioral problems began under the age of 11

Data-Driven Crime Solutions

Per the preface disclaimer, points of view or opinions in this document do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice
Step-Up’s Seattle clientele consists primarily of families with means to travel to one of the two Step-Up site locations*

Step-Up data is generally collected through self-reports and surveys/interviews of the parents

- Fifty-five percent of juveniles in Step-Up reported they have witnessed domestic violence and lived in homes with domestic violence
- Forty-eight percent of juveniles’ mothers were assaulted by their father, step-father or boyfriend
- White families appear to be overrepresented in Step-Up as compared to demographics of those prosecuted, although this finding is inconclusive given small sample size (33 Seattle-based offenders in the program)

Marital Status of Client’s Primary Caregiver

- Divorced or Separated
- Married
- Divorced then Remarried
- Single
- Widow

Client Racial Demographic

- White
- African-American
- Asian
- E.African
- Latino
- Other

Household Income

- Public Assistance
- Less than $25,000
- $25,000 to $75,000
- Greater than $75,000

*Both sites are located outside the City of Seattle within King County

Source: Step-Up Program
Step-Up clients primarily experience mental health problems and over half experienced prior abuse

Summary:

- Key indicators include a history of abuse, school-related problems, mental health problems and substance abuse.
- Over half of the juveniles reported experiencing emotional abuse, 27% had been sexually abused and 39% were physically abused by a parent.
- About 1 in 5 clients said they had or possibly had a drug problem, identifying marijuana as primary substance. Only one client admitted to abusing alcohol and 3 had attended substance abuse treatment.
  - Youth with clear substance and/or alcohol abuse issues are screened and referred to dependency counseling.
- 58% of all clients had a documented history of mental health problems.
- Most of the juveniles were currently attending school while in Step-Up.
- Of the 17 clients with behavior problems at school, 29% had problems with teachers, 35% had problems with peers and 35% had problems with both teachers and peers.

Source: Step-Up Program
Step-Up data provides additional J DV indicators for consideration

Conclusion:
- Step-Up collects qualitative data on offenders that could be leveraged to supplement court and arrest data to identify the likelihood of offenders to reoffend and to better align treatments and interventions to offenders.
- Step-Up faces severe capacity constraints and service availability is limited to families with the time and resources to commit to program completion.
- Transportation, linguistic/cultural variables and course capacity impact Step-Up’s ability to provide services to minority populations and those living in Seattle.

Charge Types:
- Assault: 73%
- Harassment: 18%
- Malicious Mischief: 9%

Past Charges:
- DV Only: 29%
- Non-DV Only: 50%
- DV and Non-DV: 21%

Source: Step-Up Program

Per the preface disclaimer, points of view or opinions in this document do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.
Tracking JDV incidents systemwide is difficult, as agencies use unique identifiers and inconsistent coding methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization(s)</th>
<th>Scope of Data</th>
<th>Basic Data Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seattle PD</td>
<td>Incident date, time and location of incident by hundred block, police area and tract, Victim and offender profile data and relationship, Offender weapon and crime description</td>
<td>Incidents Reported (2011-2013) = 873, This relates to 892 offender records and 614 matching victim records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King County Prosecuting Attorney’s Office</td>
<td>Incident date and ZIP code, crime charge, referral type/disposition and sentence type, Offender profile data</td>
<td>Referrals from Seattle PD (2011-2013) = 488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King County Juvenile Court Step-Up Program</td>
<td>Program dates, program participation, gender, age, race, Circumstances relating to: home/family, school, drugs/alcohol, mental health, criminal history</td>
<td>JDV clients for City of Seattle (2011-2013) = 33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary:
- SPD data were extracted in two sets – JDV offenders and all DV victims and then linked based on PD case number. Some victim records did not match offenders and vice versa. Records were deleted if the address was outside the City, the DV box was inaccurately checked or the offender age was over 17. Family violence was determined based on relationship between victim and offender. Race is determined by the Officer (not official or self-report) and does not include an option for Hispanic/Latino (due to RMS limitations).
- Prosecution data were provided for all Seattle PD referrals with the DV designation. Family violence was determined by linking SPD case number; there may be additional referrals that did not match for data input and other reasons. Disposition/sentencing data are not complete; unable to link the cases to the provided Court data set of filed cases due to a lack of a common identifier.
- Data were extracted from the Step-Up system for clients with an address in the City of Seattle. Conclusions are limited by the small data set.
The Diagnostic Center worked with SCT to facilitate group forums with local stakeholders

The Diagnostic Center and the SCT facilitated a community stakeholder group forum to:
- Develop a baseline understanding of the local environment from the community perspective and document the underlying criminogenic factors within various communities both in the City of Seattle and King County
- Identify opportunities to increase/enhance services provided to the community
- Bring together stakeholder groups across jurisdictions to discuss potential collaborative efforts

All community stakeholder groups identified substance abuse and mental illness as a primary factors contributing to JDV
Meeting participants identified opportunities to enhance community-based support efforts

### Applicable Contributing Factors
- **Social and Cultural Groups**
- **Juvenile Justice System**
- **Mental Health and Substance Abuse Issues**
- **Awareness and Educational System**
- **Alternative Youth Diversion/Detention**
- **Service Coordination and Resources**

### Opportunities and Strategic Improvements

#### Capacity-building through schools
- Expand School Emphasis Officers’ (SEOs) roles to increase awareness and capacity to identify underlying factors contributing to JDV and respond to at-risk youth; while cultivating positive student-police interactions to increase incident reporting
- Develop awareness and program diversions within schools
- Improve parental involvement in education and incorporate parenting skills programming

#### Cross-agency coordination
- Improve data collection and information-sharing between law enforcement, courts, juvenile justice organizations, youth services programs and community-based advocacy groups
- Develop community stakeholder working groups to improve cross-agency collaboration
- Identify opportunities to pool resources to support youth-targeted initiatives around JDV

#### Relationship-building
- Identify opportunities to build relationships between the community, youth population and law enforcement agencies
- Integrate affinity and religious groups into dialogue as they are often the first point of contact for families
Quantitative and qualitative analysis of available data indicates there are several factors contributing to JDV issues in Seattle.

**Primary Factors**

1. **UNDERSTANDING OF JDV**
   - Most DV incidents occur between juveniles and household members.
   - Juveniles are typically perceived as victims, limited response targeted toward juvenile as perpetrators of violence.
   - JDV responses tend to penalize the caregiver as source of underlying issues that may perpetuate violence.

2. **SYSTEMWIDE RESPONSE STRATEGY**
   - Detention intake criteria as law enforcement tool is restricted.
   - Criminal justice responses are limited by legal statutes and agency policies.
   - Minimal cross-agency coordination to identify and track at-risk youth or habitual offenders.

3. **PREVENTIVE MEASURES TO ADDRESS JDV**
   - Minimal efforts focused on building awareness of youth family violence issues.
   - Limited school-based or cultural-specific prevention programs that address JDV.
   - Minimal community-wide outreach to increase awareness around JDV-related crime problems.

**Secondary Factors**

1. **ACCESS TO SERVICES AND TREATMENT**
   - Relatively few cases are prosecuted and JDV offenders typically receive services only after conviction.
   - Limited access to victim assistance and safety planning for family victims.
   - Limited resources and lack of coordinated services to build organizational capacity to address JDV.

2. **SANCTIONS/TREATMENT PROGRAMS**
   - Limited sanctions and consequences available in cases where youth repeatedly commit violence.
   - Minimal data collection to identify habitual offenders and increases in seriousness of incidents.
   - When available, treatments may not correlate to severity of offense or align to needs of repeat offender.

**Contributing Factors**

- Inability to track victims/offenders through CJ system due to disparate data capture systems.
- Data capture systems are incident-based with limited data fields to provide incident context.
- Risk assessments and screening tools are limited in recognition of youth violence toward family members.

**Issue of Concern:**
To determine the nature and extent of JDV, while opportunities to enhance services delivered.
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In order to address criminogenic factors, the SCT must consider the implementation of strategic improvements.
### Overview of key strategic improvements and recommendations

#### Factor #1: Existing JDV-related outreach, awareness and intervention strategies focus heavily on intimate partner violence among youth; little attention is directed towards family-based violence

**Strategic Improvement**

Social services providers, schools, community-based organizations and local law enforcement should develop coordinated outreach initiatives to enhance awareness around JDV and family support services and resources

**Recommendations**

- Develop strategic partnerships with schools to increase awareness on JDV; leveraging existing SEOs
- Develop JDV risk matrix to proactively identify at-risk youth and provide implementation training to school staff and SEOs
- Work with community-based organizations and social service providers to identify ways to incorporate JDV educational awareness components in parenting skills courses and family counseling programs and increase culturally-specific educational modules

#### Factor #2: There is no systemwide response to target JDV issues due to procedural restrictions and minimal cross-agency coordination

**Strategic Improvement**

The SCT should establish a comprehensive, JDV-specific systemwide response strategy that spans the juvenile justice system and incorporates victim service providers

**Recommendations**

- Adopt a multi-jurisdictional (City and County), systemwide approach that provides a framework for systemically addressing JDV; increase the JJ system’s capacity to implement a coordinated response with key points of collaboration throughout the system
- Develop and implement mechanisms to increase communication and information-sharing across JJ agencies (e.g. cross-agency communications plan)
- Conduct an evaluation of current organizational policies and practices to determine points of entry and exit in the JJ system for youth offenders to inform system enhancement measures and identify appropriate insertion of proactive intervention strategies, prior to conviction
- Explore alternatives to “traditional” detention models to align service deployment at appropriate points of intervention
- Increase agency collaboration to ensure convicted youth receive appropriate treatment programs
- Conduct periodic review of risk assessments and screening tools and update, as needed, to accurately determine risk level according to model practices and legal/industry standards
- Develop cross-agency performance measures and designate a performance management team that periodically analyzes measures and recommends actions to improve performance over time
## Overview of key strategic improvements and recommendations

### Factor #3: Existing preventive measures are insufficient to address the complexities of JDV issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Improvement</th>
<th>The SCT should develop a multi-disciplinary approach to expand preventive measures beyond the mandates of specific agencies to increase awareness through community outreach and service provisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>- Conduct impact evaluations of current prevention and awareness programs; expand outreach and contact with victims post-intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Increase organizational capacity of current diversion programs and expand service accessibility by increasing site locations, providing additional services (e.g. transportation and childcare) and adapting cultural/linguistic-specific curriculum modifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Expand outreach to community-based stakeholders and advocacy groups to increase awareness around JDV issues and to develop culturally-specific intervention strategies that consider the racial/ethnic nuances of JDV violence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Factor #4: There are significant barriers to access of services and treatment and under-utilization of available services absent of court-mandated requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Improvement</th>
<th>Juvenile justice agencies should increase access to services, treatment and diversion programs through the evaluation of existing resources and identification of opportunities to enhance service coordination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>- Reduce barriers to accessing services through coordinated response models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Increase awareness of JDV-related services and resources to first-responders and responding officers to provide family information at time of incident (e.g. victim assistance services, family safety planning, temporary housing and provisions, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Increase access to diversion programs, especially for minority populations that may currently be underrepresented in diversion programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Provide ongoing training for law enforcement on JDV response strategies to include resource management and referral options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Evaluate organizational structure of Seattle Police Department and explore establishing a JDV-specific unit to inform deployment strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Consider relaxing detention criteria and/or increasing officer discretion to facilitate the removal of the offender at time of incident and to empower law enforcement to take action prior to leaving scene of an incident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Leverage informal community-based interventions to improve victim assistance and safety planning, while providing service options as alternatives to incarceration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Overview of key strategic improvements and recommendations

#### Factor #5: Significant gaps in sanctions due to limited capacity and/or willingness to prosecute habitual and serious offenders. Resistance to admit youth to detention, offering multiple diversion opportunities, ineffective interventions and minimal follow-up may increase an offender’s propensity to become repeat offenders due to lack of appropriate sanctions. Current risk assessments and screening tools lack mechanisms to adequately identify and address repeat offenders or offenders of serious crimes; thereby inhibiting access to appropriate treatment programs and/or referrals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Improvement</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Juvenile courts should consider appropriately aligning services, interventions, treatment programs and sanctions to severity of crime, co-occurring offenses and repeat offenses. |   - Explore the implementation of graduated sanctions models and tools to develop response strategies based on seriousness of the offense or incidents of habitual offenses; increase training on risk assessments and graduated sanctions as needed.  
- Increase capacity of effectively proven, data-driven programs to make more widely available to meet service demands to reduce recidivism.  
- Establish a set of multi-agency response strategies that escalates according to the number of incidents and level of threat/violence of the offender.  
- Implement evidence-based strategies and consider establishing a specialized JDV court docket to enhance offender outcomes.  
- Review existing detention intake criteria and modify to incorporate underlying identifiers related to JDV and increase officer discretion for admission. |

#### Factor #6: Current data collection and analysis methodologies to capture underlying contributing factors to JDV incidents are inadequate and there is minimal information-sharing across agencies to inform decision-making.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Improvement</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Law enforcement and justice agencies should evaluate current data capture systems against critical community needs, explore opportunities to migrate to easily translatable operating systems, develop a strategic plan to increase information-sharing across agencies and jurisdictions and integrate a crime analysis capability to better inform decision-making and operating procedures. |   - Explore opportunities to develop an integrated data repository, defining access controls to improve information-sharing across agencies.  
- Enhance data capture systems and expand data drop down fields to increase categorical options to make data collection and analysis more comprehensive and enable JJ agencies to cross-examine data for identification of high-risk and habitual offenders.  
- Institute common data capture systems with standardized fields to streamline data entry and preserve the integrity of data; provide ongoing training for reporting purposes and to ensure the quality of information captured.  
- Institute a crime analyst function to periodically audit data entry to identify crime trends and patterns, identify additional training needs and inform decision-making and deployment/policing strategies.  
- Develop JDV-specific or modify existing risk assessments and screening tools to capture qualitative data around JDV incidents. |
Crime analysis enables the identification of critical needs to efficiently deploy resources to meet service demands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Type</th>
<th>Data Element/Sample Baseline Indicators</th>
<th>Recommended Frequency</th>
<th>Correlated Expected Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criminal Justice Data</strong></td>
<td>Police Calls for Service (includes date, time, location, call type, text/notes about call)</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>Identify the nature of incidents; understand who, when and where JDV is occurring; identify frequent offenders and victims in order to respond appropriately through prevention, education, enforcement and diversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Police Crime Reports for JDV (date, time, location, suspect and victim profiles, weapon, charges, relationship, school, home address)</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>Track individuals from initial call through sentencing and treatment to identify trends and intervention points, especially for frequent offenders and victims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DA/Court Cases (referral date, filing/reject date, filing status and reject reason, charges, disposition, sentencing, diversions, offender profile)</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>Understand the indicators of JDV to identify proper treatment and justice responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Probation Cases (Status, Counselor, start/end dates, treatment)</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Step-Up and Other Diversion Programs Cases (Start/End Dates, Participation/Final Status, Client Profile, Circumstances relating to: Home/Family, School, Drugs/Alcohol, Criminal History)</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Victim and Offender Surveys</strong></td>
<td>Questions regarding home/family circumstances, event(s) leading up to and following the incident, school and employment status, whether other incidents have occurred where the police are not called, available treatment/prevention resources and victim and offender profile (demographics, address, etc.)</td>
<td>Quarterly or as needed</td>
<td>Supplement official records to more fully understand the circumstances surrounding the incidents, who is involved and ways to manage and prevent future incidents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part II: Recommendations

- Observations and Recommendations
  - Strategic Improvements
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The Diagnostic Center proposes the following training and technical assistance to support the integration of data into decision-making:

**Training and Technical Assistance Plan (TTA)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short Term (3 to 6 months)</th>
<th>Long Term (6+ months)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevention and Awareness</strong></td>
<td><strong>Data Collection and Analysis</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Synopsis:</strong> Provides a mechanism to improve awareness of JDV issues within the juvenile justice system and broader community, while identifying early intervention/prevention opportunities:</td>
<td><strong>Synopsis:</strong> Builds upon existing skills and capacity of police agencies and juvenile courts to examine data systems and expand data collection methodologies to increase communication between juvenile justice organizations:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| ‣ School-based Initiatives | ‣ Data Capture Fields  
| ‣ Victim Assistance and Family Safety Planning | ‣ Report Writing and Follow-up  
| ‣ Immediate Crisis Intervention | ‣ Performance Measures  
| ‣ Specialized Training | |
| **Data Collection and Analysis** | **Community Partnerships** |
| **Synopsis:** Develops capacity of intervention programs and community-based organizations to build awareness around JDV issues community-wide: | **Synopsis:** Leverages promising practices and lessons learned with the implementation of JDV intervention strategies: |
| ‣ Cross-agency Collaboration | ‣ Domestic Violence Alternative Center  
| ‣ Diversion Programs | ‣ Service Coordination  
| ‣ Community-based Focus Groups, targeting minority advocacy organizations | ‣ Peer-to-peer Mentoring  
| ‣ Strategic Planning | ‣ Developmentally Appropriate Graduated Sanctions  
| | ‣ Model Practice Guidelines |

*Training and Technical Assistance Plan recommendations may be implemented concurrently, recognizing that some recommendations may take longer for JJ agencies and stakeholder groups to realize.*

Per the preface disclaimer, points of view or opinions in this document do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.
TTA Topic #1: Prevention and Awareness

The SCT should work with juvenile justice agencies and local organizations to increase awareness around JDV and enhance organizational capacity to respond to JDV-related incidents

1. School-based Outreach Initiatives

- Leverage existing resources, such as Seattle’s Police Department’s SEOs to increase awareness around JDV within schools and provide additional training for early detection and identification of at-risk youth. Training and technical assistance in this area will be to expand the role of SEOs and school counselors beyond traditional prevention measures that address youth violence, truancy, bullying, alcohol and drug use to include increased education on the dynamics of youth family violence.
- **Target Audience:** SPD, school executives and school-based support service providers

2. Victim Assistance and Family Safety Planning

- Increase coordination of services to enhance awareness of and access to available services, provide support at the time of incident and ongoing support to victims of violence. Technical assistance in this area focuses on strategic planning between existing resources, specifically immediate crisis intervention services such as King County’s Children’s Crisis Outreach Response System (CCORS), SPD’s Domestic Violence Victim Support Team (VST) and mental health agencies. Cross-agency strategic planning will assist in the development of multidisciplinary cross-training and response efforts between CCORS, SPD, Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS) and Step-Up while providing opportunities to develop coordinated risk assessments and screening tools.
- **Target Audience:** CCORS, SPD, DSHS, diversion programs, mental health and youth/family service providers

3. Specialized Training

- Technical assistance on this topic is designed to provide specialized training to first responders at the time of incident. This includes building awareness around JDV-related crime problems and ability to recognize JDV at the time of incident. Training on this topic focuses on enhancing the capacity of SPD’s Domestic Violence Unit to respond to JDV incidents through increased knowledge of detention intake criteria and services available to better inform deployment strategies, case reassignment as necessary and services/referrals responding officers can provide on scene.
- **Target Audience:** SPD (including Domestic Violence Unit, detectives, dispatch and supervisory staff) and VST

*Per the preface disclaimer, points of view or opinions in this document do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.*
### TTA #2: Data Collection/Analysis and Performance Management

The Seattle Police Department, King County Prosecuting Attorney’s Office and King County Juvenile Courts can use data to develop targeted policing strategies, increase access to services and inform decision-making.

#### Data Collection and Analysis

- Training and technical assistance on this topic focuses on enhancing data collection efforts and crime analysis capabilities across JJ agencies to include systems training, basic crime analysis and reporting requirements. TA includes an examination of field screening and assessment tools as well as data entry to ensure elements of the crime, victim/offender profiles and relationships are adequately captured to enable the tracking of offenders through the JJ system. TA in this area will enable JJ professionals to leverage data to develop targeted intervention strategies at various points of entry in the JJ system, while enabling law enforcement to better identify repeat offenders as they go through the system. Additionally, knowledge of spatial and temporal patterns of incidents can help inform prevention and resource allocation strategies.

- **Target Audience:** JJ agencies and local law enforcement

#### Performance Management

- Performance measures should be established to help justice agencies gauge ongoing performance. Technical assistance on this topic focuses on developing a basic set of core measures that address key system responses (such as efficiency, efficacy, access to services) to be incorporated into case management systems. For example, the use of graduated sanctions can be measured by calculating the percentage of offenders by type (first-time, repeat, felony) with varying level of sanctions. Additional, TA focuses on establishing a performance management team to monitor the measures and examine trends. Performance management encourages the use of specific measures to document performance, identify gaps and develop solutions.

- **Target Audience:** JJ agencies and local law enforcement
The SCT should work with the Extended Team to establish partnerships across organizational sectors to develop community-based strategies to increase awareness and access to services.

1. Cross-agency Collaboration
   - The City of Seattle has a wealth of resources and services that address a wide-array of family problems including substance abuse, mental illness, child welfare, domestic violence, etc. Training and technical assistance on this topic provides strategic planning to enhance the collaboration of community-based organizations to leverage existing resources and maximize efficiencies through the coordination of services delivered and outreach. Establishing community partnerships through strategic planning will assist in augmenting resource limitations of existing diversions and treatment programs and provide opportunities to enhance training of providers to include culturally-specific curriculum adaptations, while increasing access to services for targeted populations and provide wraparound services to at-risk youth through informal channels outside of the juvenile justice system.
   - **Target Audience:** Social service providers, diversion programs

2. Community Involvement
   - Given the sensitivities surrounding JDV issues and a reluctance/unwillingness to report JDV-related crime problems, the SCT should focus on developing community-based intervention strategies. Technical assistance in this area focuses on outreach to the faith-based community, immigrant groups, mentoring programs, local leaders and community advocacy groups (particularly minority specific) to increase awareness around JDV issues, providing culturally-specific programming to enhance prevention efforts with the goal of reshaping youth behavior without family victim blaming.
   - **Target Audience:** Seattle Extended Team and community-based groups
The SCT should leverage model practices to address JDV issues and establish peer-to-peer exchanges

1. Domestic Violence Alternative Center
   - Technical assistance in this area will involve an evaluation of the existing Youth Services Center (YSC) that houses the juvenile detention center for King County and the detention intake criteria, while establishing partnerships to explore the development of the Domestic Violence Alternative Center (DVAC) to enhance the provision of services provided and increase capacity to provide crisis debriefings, accountability conferences, referrals to behavioral health treatment providers, etc. Peer-to-peer support from agencies such as the Pima County Juvenile Court Center and Lutheran Social Services will focus on leveraging best practices and lessons learned for the implementation of comprehensive, multi-disciplinary prevention, response and diversion strategies.
   - **Target Audience:** King County Juvenile Courts (Partnership for Youth Justice program), King County Juvenile Division and YSC, Seattle Police Department, King County Sheriff’s Office and other law enforcement partners

2. Violence Prevention and Deterrence
   - Training and technical assistance on this topic focuses on the examination of JDV incident data, referrals and disposition outcomes to enhance systemwide response strategies targeted toward habitual offenders and offenders of serious JDV-related crime. Trainings will include the development and implementation of graduated sanctions tools, intensive supervision protocols, focused deterrence strategies and coordination of services to reduce recidivism and increase accessibility to immediate crisis interventions services. Technical assistance will also focus on the development of model guidelines for therapeutic interventions with social services and mental health service providers for youth and families. Additional training provisions to enhance services delivered and data collection across the juvenile justice system for the identification of high-risk offenders is recommended.
   - **Target Audience:** JJ agencies, mental health and youth/family crisis intervention service providers
The Diagnostic Center identified data-driven and evidence-based practices that align to Seattle’s goals and objectives

The SCT seeks data-driven strategies to address juvenile domestic violence

- Evidence-based models were identified through CrimeSolutions.gov, as well as other evidence-based directories, such as U.S. Health and Human Services’ Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administrations (SAMHSA) National Registry of Evidence-Based Programs and Practices
- Promising practices were also identified through a review of directories as well as a review of recent research in the criminal justice field

### Intervention and Prevention Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Areas</th>
<th>Model Programs and Promising Practices*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth Intervention and Substance Abuse/Mental Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Aggression Replacement Training® (ART®)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Multisystemic Therapy (MST)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Multisystemic Therapy – Substance Abuse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Multisystemic Therapy – Family Integrated Transitions (MST-FIT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SNAP® Under 12 Outreach Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Trauma-focused Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (TF-CBT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Incredible Years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family-focused Interventions and Parenting Skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Kids Club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Project Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• HOMEBUILDERS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Functional Family Therapy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Multidimensional Family Therapy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Parenting with Love and Limits®</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Trip P – Positive Parenting Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-based Interventions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Safe Dates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cognitive Behavioral Intervention for Trauma in Schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Linking the Interests of Families and Teachers (LIFT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Families and Schools Together (FAST)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Second Step®: A Violence Prevention Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies (PATHS®)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courts, Corrections and Recidivism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adolescent Diversion Project (Michigan State University)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reduce Probation Caseload in Evidence-based Settings (IA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Jackson County (OR) Community Family Court</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Connections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Indianapolis (IN) Family Group Conferencing Experiment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Moral Reconciliation Therapy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Charlotte-Mecklenburg (NC) Police Department Domestic Violence Unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Promising Practices*
Next Steps and Contact Information

**Next Steps**

Thank you for working with the Diagnostic Center.

We will continue to coordinate activities to minimize the impact on regular duties of community leaders.

Our next steps are to:

- Discuss recommendations and training and technical assistance plan
- Prioritize models and practices for implementation
- Develop implementation strategy with training and technical assistance delivery to the SCT

**Contact Information for the OJP Diagnostic Center**

**Your Requesting Community Leaders:**
David G. Jones, City Auditor
Claudia Gross Shader, Assistant City Auditor

**Your Diagnostic Specialist:**
Angela Jackson-Castain
Angela@OJPDiagnosticCenter.org

**Main Telephone:**
(855) OJP-0411 (or 855-657-0411)

**Main Email:**
contact@OJPDiagnosticCenter.org

**Website:**
www.OJPDiagnosticCenter.org
Resource Guide
City of Seattle, Office of City Auditor

Opportunities for Evidence-Based Technical Assistance

Deliberative and Pre-decisional
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Note: This resource guide is not intended to provide an exhaustive list of all juvenile domestic violence (JDV) resources and references, but provides general information and widely available technical assistance resources for policymakers interested in learning more about efforts to address JDV issues. Specified recommendations for communities are available upon request to the OJP Diagnostic Center.

The following Research Resource Guide provides a brief overview of research on juvenile domestic violence (JDV). The study of JDV has also been labeled as: child-to-parent violence (CPV), parent abuse, adolescent violence against parents, sibling abuse or violence and juvenile violence against household members, among other labels. The table below is divided into three sections, separating research on sibling violence and CPV, as well as highlighting international research on the topics. Each article listed below includes a brief summary of the work and a hyperlink to the resource (underlined), if available, or an abstract of the resource. Copies of all of the articles are also available from the Diagnostic Center team. While the majority of the research focuses on efforts in the United States, the final entries in this section highlight experiences from the United Kingdom, Spain and Australia, to provide a sense of how other countries are approaching these issues.

a. Sibling Violence Research Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Research Abstract (Summary of Research and Findings)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Sibling Maltreatment: The Forgotten Abuse  
  • Kiselica & Morrill-Richards, 2007  
  • Journal of Counseling and Development, Vol. 85 | **Overview of Research:**  
Great advances have been made in the study of family violence in the past 30 years. However, sibling abuse and its prevalence in the family have largely been overlooked. In this article, the major issues associated with sibling maltreatment are highlighted and strategies for helping the victims and perpetrators of sibling abuse and their families are described. |
| Ethnic Perspectives on Sibling Abuse in the United States  
  • Rapoza, Cook, Zaveri, Malley-Morrison, 2010  
  • Journal of Family Issues, Vol. 31 | **Survey of Youth:**  
Sibling abuse has been studied much less extensively than other forms of family violence in the United States; moreover, research on how sibling abuse is viewed in different ethnic-minority groups has been rare. Convenience samples of Native American (n = 25), Latino/Hispanic (n = 45), African American (n = 30), European American (n = 78), Asian Pacific American (n = 31) and South Asian American (n = 29) participants responded to an open-ended survey requesting examples of extreme, moderate and mild sibling abuse. Asian Pacific Americans listed proportionately more instances of physical aggression in their examples of mild abuse and of psychological aggression in their examples of severe abuse—an inverse of the pattern in the other groups. South Asian Americans mentioned beating and hitting significantly more often than other groups. In addition, European American participants gave the most instances of sexual abuse. Gender differences were found, with women mentioning physical aggression between siblings more often than men. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Research Abstract (Summary of Research and Findings)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Risk Behaviors Among Victims of Sibling Violence</td>
<td><strong>Survey of Youth:</strong> Despite the fact that sibling abuse has been documented as the most common form of intra-familial abuse, it has been largely overlooked. Using data from the 2007 Delaware Secondary School Student Survey (N= 8,122), this paper focuses on four objectives: to estimate prevalence of sibling abuse; examine the relationship between sibling violence and high-risk behaviors such as substance use, delinquency and aggression; explore the interplay of sibling abuse and other forms of family violence in predicting high risk behaviors; and test theory. Results confirm that sibling violence is significantly related to substance use, delinquency and aggression. These effects remain significant after controlling for other forms of family violence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Button &amp; Gealt, 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Journal of Family Violence, Vol. 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kid’s Stuff: The Nature and Impact of Peer and Sibling Violence on Younger and Older Children</td>
<td><strong>Survey of Youth:</strong> It is widely presumed that when children are hit by peers or siblings, it is not as serious as similar acts between adults or older youth, which would be termed “assaults” and “violent crimes.” With a sample of 2,030 children between the ages of two and 17, the goal of this study was to compare the violent peer and sibling episodes of younger children to those of older youth in terms of their seriousness and association with symptoms that might indicate traumatic effect. The younger children’s peer and sibling victimizations were not less serious than the older youth on the dimensions of injury, being hit with an object that could cause injury or being victimized on multiple occasions. Younger children and older youth also had similar trauma symptom levels associated with both peer and sibling victimization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Finkelhor, Turner &amp; Ormrod, 2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Child Abuse &amp; Neglect, Vol. 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### b. Child-to-Parent Violence Research Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Research Abstract (Summary of Research and Findings)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Domestic Assaults by Juvenile Offenders**                           | **National Statistics:** According to data from the FBI’s National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS):  
- Half (51%) of juvenile domestic assault offenders victimized a parent and one-quarter (24%) victimized a sibling.  
- When the domestic assault was against a parent, the parent was most likely the mother for both juvenile male (68%) and juvenile female offenders (81%).  
- Juveniles were least likely to commit an assault with another offender when the victim was a parent (11%).  
- Forty-eight percent of juvenile domestic assault offenders were arrested, compared with 31% of juvenile offenders who assaulted acquaintances and 32% of juvenile offenders who assaulted strangers. |
| Snyder & McCurley, 2008                                               |                                                                                                                                  |
| U.S. Office of Justice Programs/OJJDP Bulletin                        |                                                                                                                                  |
| **National Statistics:** According to data from the FBI’s National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS):  
- Half (51%) of juvenile domestic assault offenders victimized a parent and one-quarter (24%) victimized a sibling.  
- When the domestic assault was against a parent, the parent was most likely the mother for both juvenile male (68%) and juvenile female offenders (81%).  
- Juveniles were least likely to commit an assault with another offender when the victim was a parent (11%).  
- Forty-eight percent of juvenile domestic assault offenders were arrested, compared with 31% of juvenile offenders who assaulted acquaintances and 32% of juvenile offenders who assaulted strangers. |
<p>| <strong>Family Violence Statistics</strong>                                        | <strong>National Statistics:</strong> This compendium contains the most recent family violence statistics from these sources: surveys conducted by the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS), the BJS database of Federal statistics and two statistical databases maintained by the FBI. The sources provide statistical snapshots of family violence at different stages in the administration of justice. First are statistics on the nature and extent of family violence. Next are statistics on family violence that is reported to police, followed by statistics on the prosecution of persons charged with family violence. Lastly are statistics on persons sent to prison or jail for family violence. |
| U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2005                               |                                                                                                                                  |
| <strong>National Statistics:</strong> This compendium contains the most recent family violence statistics from these sources: surveys conducted by the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS), the BJS database of Federal statistics and two statistical databases maintained by the FBI. The sources provide statistical snapshots of family violence at different stages in the administration of justice. First are statistics on the nature and extent of family violence. Next are statistics on family violence that is reported to police, followed by statistics on the prosecution of persons charged with family violence. Lastly are statistics on persons sent to prison or jail for family violence. |
| <strong>Child-Parent Violence: An Empirical Analysis of Offender, Victim, and Event Characteristics in a National Sample of Reported Incidents</strong> | <strong>National Statistics and Overview of Research:</strong> CPV is arguably the most under-researched form of family violence, despite an extremely high rate of occurrence and increasing prevalence. The current research examined a large cross-national sample of reported offenders (n=17,957), collected as part of the 2002 NIBRS. Aggregate results suggest, in part, that white biological mothers older than 40 years of age are most likely to be victimized by their male children 14 – 17 years of age. Further, a majority of assaults involve personal weapons (hands or feet) and tend to result in injury or no injury with very few offenders under the influence of alcohol or drugs. This research both corroborates and contrasts past findings of CPV research providing new insights into this complex crime and the data needed to inform theory and test hypotheses. |
| Walsh &amp; Krienert, 2007                                                 |                                                                                                                                  |
| Journal of Family Violence, Vol. 22                                   |                                                                                                                                  |
| <strong>National Statistics and Overview of Research:</strong> CPV is arguably the most under-researched form of family violence, despite an extremely high rate of occurrence and increasing prevalence. The current research examined a large cross-national sample of reported offenders (n=17,957), collected as part of the 2002 NIBRS. Aggregate results suggest, in part, that white biological mothers older than 40 years of age are most likely to be victimized by their male children 14 – 17 years of age. Further, a majority of assaults involve personal weapons (hands or feet) and tend to result in injury or no injury with very few offenders under the influence of alcohol or drugs. This research both corroborates and contrasts past findings of CPV research providing new insights into this complex crime and the data needed to inform theory and test hypotheses. |
|                      |                                                                                                                                  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Research Abstract (Summary of Research and Findings)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent Abuse on the Rise: A Historical Review</td>
<td>Overview of Research: In comparison to child and spousal abuse, the issue of parents being abused by their adolescent children has received very little attention by the mental health profession even though its prevalence is comparable. The most frequent form of parent abuse is physical at 57%, followed by verbal abuse at 22%, the use of a weapon—usually a knife or gun—at 17% and throwing items at 5%. Regardless of gender 11% of children under age ten physically abuse their parents. In pertaining to the victims, 82% percent of parent abuse is against mothers, while only 18% is against fathers. This paper reviews a brief history of parental abuse starting with Casare Lombroso and ending with present day studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence by Children Against Mothers in Relation to Violence Between Parents and Corporal Punishment by Parents</td>
<td>Examination of 1975 National Family Violence Survey: The objective of this research is to further investigate CPV, especially violence against mothers, and whether violence by fathers against mothers is associated with an increased probability of children hitting their mother. A summary of previous literature on CPV is provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teenage Violence Toward Parents as an Adaptation to Family Strain</td>
<td>Survey of Youth: Certain strain and social learning theorists contend that CPV represents a functional response to family adversity (or strain). In particular, these theorists suggest that child-to-parent aggression can be understood partly as an attempt to cope with negative treatment by parents or other family members. In this study, longitudinal data from a national survey of male adolescents are analyzed to test the assumption that child aggression represents a functional response to family strain. Consistent with theoretical accounts, the results indicate a reciprocal relationship between parental and child aggression, characterized by countervailing effects. Although aggression by parents (slapping) tends to foster aggression on the part of the male adolescent child, aggression by the male adolescent child tends to deter the assaultive behavior of parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Family Affair: The Juvenile Court and Family Violence Cases</td>
<td>Research Examining Treatment of Adolescent Family Violence Offenders in Court: Little attention has been devoted to studies of adolescent family violence offending, yet research on adult populations show that victim relationship may make a difference in how offenders are treated in the criminal justice system. This study examines differences in court treatment between family and non-family offenders.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### c. International Child-to-Parent Violence Research Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Research Abstract (Summary of Research and Findings)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problematising the Relationship between Teenage Boys and Parent Abuse: Constructions of Masculinity and Violence</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Baker, 2012&lt;br&gt;• Social Policy &amp; Society, Vol. 11&lt;br&gt;• United Kingdom</td>
<td><strong>Overview of Research:</strong>&lt;br&gt;Although research into parent abuse is scant in the context of the UK, there is now a burgeoning of interest into how this form of family violence fits into the historically well-defined arena of domestic violence research. This article investigates one aspect of the phenomena of parent abuse; that is, how teenage boys, who are often perceived as perpetrators of such violence due to problematic ‘cycle of violence’ or ‘intergenerational transmission of violence’ theories, are constructed in relation to it. These now widely discredited theories, which correlate being a man with being violent, are problematic, but may re-emerge as a possible explanation for parent abuse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adolescent Violence Toward Parents</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Bobic, 2004&lt;br&gt;• Australian Domestic and Family Violence Clearinghouse&lt;br&gt;• Australia</td>
<td><strong>Overview of Research:</strong>&lt;br&gt;The widespread belief that parents need to protect their children, even when it is to their own detriment, and the lack of clarity about what is acceptable and what is violent adolescent behavior have compounded the slow recognition of adolescent violence against parents amongst helping professions and policy makers. This paper describes Australian and international research to date, points out the overlapping nature of different forms of family violence and encourages active debate about parental abuse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>When Family Life Hurts: Family Experience of Aggression in Children</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Parentline Plus, 2010&lt;br&gt;• United Kingdom</td>
<td><strong>Survey of Parents:</strong>&lt;br&gt;Using data from Parentline calls, a web survey filled in by parents experiencing aggressive behavior from their children and secondary research, this report examines the link between parenting and aggressive behavior in children and adolescents. The scale and intensity of the aggression and abuse that many parents report make it likely that a significant number of these calls relate to children with, or at risk of, developing conduct disorders. This paper investigates the link between conduct disorders and parenting, concluding that the provision of effective parenting support can reduce the occurrence and impact of aggressive episodes associated with conduct problems and improve the mental health and wellbeing of parents and children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Research Abstract (Summary of Research and Findings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Child-to-Parent Violence: Emotional and Behavioral Predictors**  
  - Calvete, Orue & Gamez-Guadix, 2013  
  - Journal of Interpersonal Violence, Vol. 28  
  - Spain | **Survey of Youth:**  
  CPV includes acts committed by a child to intentionally cause physical, psychological or financial pain to a parent. Available data indicate increasing rates of CPV in Spain, which have been attributed to a tendency toward more permissive parenting styles and changes in the power cycles within the families. The primary aim of this study was to assess the predictive role of some behavioral and emotional characteristics of adolescents who perpetrate CPV. A total of 1,072 adolescents (601 girls) filled out measures of CPV, proactive and reactive aggression, depressive symptoms and substance abuse at Time 1 and measures of CPV 6 months later. The results showed that CPV was predicted by proactive, but not by reactive, aggression. This finding supports an instrumental role for CPV, which should be understood in the context of permissibility and lack of limits within the family. Depression and substance abuse also predicted the increase of CPV over time. Findings of this study suggest a psychological profile that combines internalizing problems and an instrumental use of violence in adolescents who perpetrate CPV. These characteristics are important for interventions. |
2. Juvenile Domestic Violence Model Programs Resource Guide

While some forms of juvenile domestic violence (JDV) are best treated through individualized therapy, group therapies or programming may be useful for others. There is a small number of programs focused on responding to JDV in the United States. Some of these programs have been developed to help modify the activities of juveniles, while others have been established to provide support for family members suffering from abuse. King County’s (WA) Step-Up Program is the most well-known program in the United States. This guide identifies JDV programs, provides hyperlinks (underlined) to information about the programs and, if available, provides an abstract from the program description or evaluation. In addition to the American programs, a small collection of similar programs that have been undertaken in the United Kingdom, Canada and Australia are included in this guide.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Program</th>
<th>Program Summary/ Research Abstract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why Juvenile Courts Should Address Family Violence: Promising Practices to Improve Intervention Outcomes</td>
<td>Court-based programs for juveniles</td>
<td><strong>Program Descriptions:</strong> The prevalence of domestic violence in juvenile court cases justifies modifying our interventions to reflect this unfortunate reality. Part I examines family violence’s prevalence in the juvenile court caseloads, despite its lack of consideration in most dispositions. Part II begins with a comparative analysis of the drug court trend and discusses the trend’s applicability for specialized family violence applications in the Juvenile Court. The King County Juvenile Court’s Step-Up Program is introduced, which directly addresses family violence with intervention programs for youth perpetrators and abused parents, followed by the Santa Clara County (CA) Juvenile Court’s Family Violence program, shown as a model worthy of replication. Part III details the process by which the Travis County (TX) Juvenile Court is implementing a program similar to these models.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Domestic and Family Violence: The Effects of Court-Based Intervention Programs on Recidivism</td>
<td>Court-based programs for juveniles</td>
<td><strong>Program Evaluation:</strong> This study tested the effectiveness of two court-based intervention programs in California (Santa Clara County, San Francisco County) that addressed juvenile domestic and family violence. The court-based intervention programs included an intake assessment process for domestic and family violence, specialized prosecution and defense, a dedicated docket, intensive supervision, offender programs and victim services. Data on program completion showed that (1) Santa Clara County had the lowest rate of successful program completion and (2) offenders with prior delinquency records were less likely to successfully complete probation and program...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Type of Program</td>
<td>Program Summary/ Research Abstract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Family Violence Intervention Program**  
  • Palm Beach County, FL | Court-based program for juveniles | All things being equal, the likelihood of successfully completing the probation program increased if the offender did not violate probation, the offender was placed on electronic monitoring, the offender was not in Santa Clara County and the offender was young. |
| **Domestic Violence Alternative Center**  
  • Pima County, AZ | Court-based program for juveniles | **Program Description:**  
  The Family Violence Intervention Program (FVIP) is a Court Diversion Program (Administrative Order 7.009) for first time juvenile offenders who have been charged with domestic battery/assault. It was developed as a diversion program to focus on the unique problems of each family whose child has committed domestic violence. |
| **Mediation Can Work for Juvenile-Perpetrated Domestic Violence: A Second Look at Family Violence Mediation**  
  • Schweitzer, 2008  
  • The Mayhew-Hite Report on Dispute Resolution and the Courts, Vol. 6  
  o Franklin County, OH Court Mediation Program for Youth Charged with Domestic Violence Offenses | Mediation program for juveniles | **Program Description:**  
  Domestic violence by juveniles against parents is a growing problem that tends to involve the court in parent-teenager conflict situations. Despite the impulse to send juveniles charged with domestic violence offenses to court, these sensitive family disputes receive little benefit from adversarial adjudication. Mediation of juvenile-perpetrated domestic violence in a safe, structured environment can provide benefits to juveniles and parents unavailable in litigation. Mediation shifts the focus from blame and denial to the development of conflict-reducing strategies for parents and youths. Critics of domestic violence mediation argue that the power imbalance and pattern of abuse present in most partner domestic violence situations prohibit victims from negotiating freely. Juvenile-perpetrated domestic violence cases, however, do not typically involve a power struggle between the parties or a pattern of abuse and therefore these disputes are more appropriate for mediation. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Program</th>
<th>Program Summary/ Research Abstract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth Violence: An Exploratory Study of a Treatment Program in a Central Illinois County</td>
<td>Community treatment program for juveniles</td>
<td><strong>Program Evaluation:</strong> A local treatment provider has developed an OPTIONS program to prevent adolescent aggression. The program is designed for youth who displayed threatening or abusive behaviors, particularly toward family members. This study described the characteristics of juveniles and their families who were referred to the program and examine whether or not program participation helped reduce the severity of violence and improve the communication skills among program participants. Referrals came from law enforcement, juvenile court services, school resource officers and parents. Information on 100 juveniles and their families were provided by the counselors of the program. The findings showed that a large percentage of juveniles came from unstable families with a family history of criminal convictions, substance abuse or mental illness. Program participants showed an improvement in communication skills and reduction in their levels of dangerousness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building a Sibling Aggression Treatment Model</td>
<td>Treatment model for juveniles</td>
<td><strong>Program Description and Case Study:</strong> One strategy for addressing the persistent challenge of advancing empirically based social work practice is to engage practitioners in the formulation of empirically developed practice guidelines. One such concern involves sibling aggression, which is exceptionally widespread with known deleterious consequences but it has received scant attention in intervention literature. This article illustrates a practitioner’s development of a task-centered sibling aggression treatment model using the design and development research paradigm, a methodology for systematically formulating, testing and refining practice guidelines. It also introduces a promising sibling aggression treatment model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triple P (Positive Parenting Program)</td>
<td>Intervention program for parents</td>
<td><strong>Program Description (International):</strong> Triple P gives parents simple and practical strategies to help them confidently manage their children’s behavior and prevent problems developing and building strong, healthy relationships. Triple P is currently used in 25 countries and has been shown to work across cultures, socio-economic groups and in all kinds of family structures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Kethineni, Blimling, Bozarth & Gaines, 2004
- International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, Vol. 48
  - McLean County, IL

- Caspi, 2008
- Research on Social Work Practice, Vol. 18

- Coalition for Evidence-Based Policy Review of Triple P
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Program</th>
<th>Program Summary/ Research Abstract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Adolescent Violence Toward Parents: Maintaining Family Connections When the Going Gets Tough**  
  - Paterson, Luntz, Perlez, & Cotton, 2002  
  - The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Family Therapy, Vol. 23  
    - Anglicare, Eastern Youth Services  
    - Australia | Intervention program for mothers | **Program Description and Case Study (Australia):** This paper explores some of the dilemmas, difficulties and decisions faced by mothers whose adolescent sons or daughters act in violent and abusive ways and refuse any counseling. A group intervention program, designed to assist these mothers in more fully understanding and addressing their adolescent’s behavior, was evaluated using both quantitative and qualitative methods. Self-report questionnaire data indicated that following the group intervention the mothers reported less violence in their homes and significantly less personal anxiety and fatigue. However, these women continued to experience high levels of depression. |
| **Responding to Child-to-Parent Violence: Innovative Practices in Child and Adolescent Mental Health**  
  - Coogan, 2014  
  - Health & Social Work, Vol. 39  
    - Non Violent Resistance Programme  
    - Ireland | Intervention program for parents | **Program Description and Case Study (Ireland):** CPV is a growing social problem with broad implications for research, policy and intervention. Although the initial referral to out-patient child and adolescent mental health services for assessment and intervention may be related to concerns about attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder, depression or out-of-control behaviors, more parents are beginning to talk with embarrassment and fear about their experiences of being the target of their child’s aggression and violence at home. This article examines the prevalence of CPV and proposes a clear definition of CPV for social work practitioners and researchers in mental health. Using an outline case example from community mental health practice in Ireland, the author suggests the Non Violent Resistance Programme as one innovative response to the problem of CPV. |
| **Nonviolent Resistance: A Treatment for Parents of Children with Acute Behavior Problems**  
  - Weinblatt & Omer, 2008  
  - Journal of Marital Family Therapy, Vol. 34  
  - Israel | Intervention program for parents | **Program Evaluation (Israel):** Non-violent resistance (NVR) is a new training model aimed at helping parents deal effectively with their helplessness, isolation and escalatory interactions with their children. The purpose of this study is to evaluate training in NVR with the parents of children with acute behavior problems. Seventy-three parents (41 families) were randomly assigned to a treatment group and wait-list control group. Measures were taken at pre-treatment, post-treatment and a 1-month follow-up. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Program</th>
<th>Program Summary/ Research Abstract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Responding to Child to Parent Violence: A Pan European Project**  
- University of Brighton, UK, 2014 | Program Description (Europe):  
The project aims to raise awareness of CPV, find out how countries across Europe deal with it and provide a toolkit for practitioners who work with young people and parents experiencing this problem. The project will evaluate intervention models currently in use – in particular Break 4 Change (Brighton and Hove City Council) and Non Violent Resistance (National University of Ireland, Galway) – and investigate how these models could be used effectively in other countries. |

The majority of the JDV programs included in Section 2 have not been widely evaluated for their effectiveness and results of the programs may be anecdotal. Communities interested in developing programming to respond to juvenile domestic violence may also find information about programs targeted at juvenile violence in general useful. A short list of juvenile violence programs that have been found to be effective is included in this guide. Hyperlinks (underlined) are available to provide more information about the programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Program</th>
<th>Program Summary/ Research Abstract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Aggression Replacement Training      | Youth training  | Aggression Replacement Training® (ART®) concentrates on development of individual competencies to address various emotional and social aspects that contribute to aggressive behavior in youths. Program techniques are designed to teach youths how to control their angry impulses and take perspectives other than their own. The main goal is to reduce aggression and violence among youths by providing them with opportunities to learn pro-social skills in place of aggressive behavior.  
  • Washington State Aggression Replacement Training Resources  
  • Campbell Collaboration review of Aggression Replacement Training |
| Functional Family Therapy            | Youth therapy   | Functional Family Therapy (FFT) was founded in the 1970s by Dr. James F. Alexander. FFT is the model's training and dissemination organization. The FFT model has received international recognition for its outcomes in helping troubled youth and their families to overcome delinquency, substance abuse and violence. It is a short-term treatment strategy that is built on a foundation of respect of individuals, families and cultures, but that includes powerful treatment strategies that pave the way for motivating individuals and families to become more adaptive and successful in their own lives. FFT helps to save families while at the same time preventing crime and victimization in communities.  
  • Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development review of FFT  
  • Functional Family Therapy in Washington State  
  • OJJDP Bulletin on Functional Family Therapy |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Program</th>
<th>Program Summary/ Research Abstract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| First Step to Success               | Child training         | First Step to Success is an early intervention program designed to identify children with antisocial behavior and introduce adaptive behavioral strategies to prevent antisocial behavior in school. The program has both school and home components. The primary goal of the program is to divert antisocial kindergartners from an antisocial behavior patterns and develop in them the competencies needed to build effective teacher- and peer-related, social–behavioral adjustments.  
• U.S. Department of Education's review of First Steps to Success                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| Brief Strategic Family Therapy      | Family-based therapy   | Brief Strategic Family Therapy® (BSFT®) is designed to prevent, reduce and/or treat youth behavior problems and improve family functioning, including effective parental leadership and involvement with the youth. (Improve youth’s behavior by improving family relationships.) The BSFT® Program targets children and adolescents between the ages of six and 17 who display or are at risk for developing behavior problems, including substance abuse, conduct problems and delinquency. The BSFT® Program has been implemented as a prevention, early intervention and intervention strategy for delinquent and substance-abusing adolescents.  
• CrimeSolutions.gov review of Brief Strategic Family Therapy  
• OJJD P Bulletin on Brief Strategic Family Therapy                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| Alternatives for Families           | Family-based therapy   | Alternatives for Families: A Cognitive-Behavioral Therapy (AF-CBT) is an evidence-based intervention designed to improve the relationship between children and their caregivers by addressing family problems relating to:  
• Frequent family conflicts  
• Behavior problems, including physical aggression  
• Anger and verbal aggression, including emotional abuse  
• Harsh physical discipline, physical aggression or child physical abuse  
• Child trauma-related symptoms secondary to any of the above  
Any and all of these patterns above may be demonstrated by an individual caregiver or a child/adolescent, but they may also characterize the interactions of the entire family. Accordingly, AF-CBT targets caregiver and child/adolescent characteristics and the larger family context.  
• CrimeSolutions.gov review of Alternatives for Families |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Program</th>
<th>Program Summary/ Research Abstract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Adolescent Diversion Project  | Youth diversion | The Michigan State University Adolescent Project (MSUAP) (in collaboration with Ingham County [MI] Circuit Court) has provided quality advocacy services to youth in Ingham County since 1976. Michigan State University trains undergraduate students as advocates to provide a strength-based intervention to youth who are referred by the Ingham County Circuit Court. The primary goal of MSUAP is to help youth avoid future involvement with the juvenile justice system. Advocates design intervention programs tailored to each youth's strengths, skills/abilities and unmet needs. The goals are accomplished by providing the youth with an opportunity to gain access to community resources, partake in civic engagement, etc.  
- CrimeSolutions.gov review of the Adolescent Diversion Project  
- The Adolescent Diversion Project: 25 Years of Research on an Ecological Model of Intervention (Smith et al., 2004) |
| Adolescent Diversion Program  | Youth diversion | In January 2012, Chief Judge Jonathan Lippman and the New York Court System created the Adolescent Diversion Program (ADP) to rethink the court system's approach to 16- and 17-year-olds with pending criminal cases. The pilot was conducted in nine locations: the five boroughs of New York City and the New York counties of Erie, Nassau, Onondaga and Westchester. At each site, criminal cases involving 16- and 17-year-olds were sent to judges who received special training and access to age-appropriate services for adolescents. Researchers from the Center for Court Innovation conducted an evaluation on the early effects of the initiative, comparing cases from the first six months of the initiative with similar cases from the prior year (2011).  
- Center for Court Innovation evaluation of the Adolescent Diversion Program |
<p>| Youth Domestic Violence Court  | Youth diversion | Launched in late 2003, Brooklyn’s Youthful Offender Domestic Violence Court was the first court to address exclusively misdemeanor domestic violence cases among teenagers between the ages of 16 and 19. At the Youthful Offender Domestic Violence Court a dedicated judge and court room staff are equipped to address the unique needs that teen complainants bring to court. By linking victims to a specialized services and offering a free 12- |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Program</th>
<th>Program Summary/ Research Abstract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Connections                  | Court-based services program for youth | • Endorsed and supported by the Superior Court Judges and the Board of County Commissioners, the Juvenile Court, in partnership with the mental health community, developed Connections, a strength-based, family-centered program that significantly increases services to juvenile offenders with behavioral health issues. Balanced and Restorative Justice principles and values are incorporated in the program design to increase youth competencies, provide services to victims and to increase public safety. Families, especially parents, are seen as full partners in developing, delivering and implementing interventions in a wraparound process to ensure that services respond to the real needs and concerns of youth and families.  
• [CrimeSolutions.gov](http://CrimeSolutions.gov) review of Connections |
| Common Sense Parenting       | Parent training    | • Common Sense Parenting® (CSP) is a practical, skill-based parenting program that can be applied to every family. The program's logical strategies and easy-to-learn techniques address issues of communication, discipline, decision making, relationships, self-control and school success. Continuing to learn new skills and strategies is a fundamental part of good parenting. The proactive skills and techniques taught in Common Sense Parenting® classes have helped parents from diverse backgrounds create healthy family relationships that foster safety and well-being at home, in school and in the community.  
• [CrimeSolutions.gov](http://CrimeSolutions.gov) review of Common Sense Parenting |

Although juvenile domestic violence (JDV) has received little attention in the past, a few states have begun to incorporate juvenile violence into their domestic violence laws and have developed criminal justice system responses for juveniles involved in familial violence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Summary of Research and Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Connecticut Domestic Violence and Juveniles Law | **Family Violence Law**  
Sect 46b-38a: (1) “Family violence” means an incident resulting in physical harm, bodily injury or assault, or an act of threatened violence that constitutes fear of imminent physical harm, bodily injury or assault, including, but not limited to, stalking or a pattern of threatening, between family or household members. Verbal abuse or argument shall not constitute family violence unless there is present danger and the likelihood that physical violence will occur. |
| Proposed: Florida Abuse of Parent Law      | Proposed January 2014:  
SB 904/ HB 485  
Defining the terms “child” and “parent” for purposes of the crimes of abuse of a parent, aggravated abuse of a parent, exploitation of a parent’s assets, and emotional abuse of a parent; providing the elements of such crimes; providing criminal penalties; authorizing alternative sentencing under certain circumstances; requiring reporting of the abuse of a parent or exploitation of a parent’s assets to the Department of Children and Families’ central abuse hotline; providing immunity for a person who makes such a report, etc. |
| California Juvenile Domestic Violence Courts | In California, JDV courts were established in response to the increase in teen dating violence as well as family violence initiated by teens and violence between teen parents who are not married. The juvenile domestic violence court, sometimes called dating violence or youth violence court, focuses on youth who have committed violence in the context of a specific relationship. These courts addresses violent incidents against a person who would be considered an intimate, such as a spouse, girlfriend/boyfriend or someone in a dating relationship, or acts of abuse directed at a close family member, such as a parent or sibling. The approach focuses on two areas: ensuring accountability by addressing the behavior of the minor who is committing the abusive act(s) and ensuring safety and providing support for the victim. |
5. Juvenile Domestic Violence Internet Resource Guide

In addition to the research on juvenile domestic violence (JDV) and programs responding to JDV, there are also a number of sites that host information and communication pages for individuals seeking support. A small collection of these resources are highlighted in this guide.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Website</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sibling Abuse Survivors’ Information and Advocacy Network (SASIAN)</td>
<td>Sibling Abuse</td>
<td>Sibling abuse is more prevalent than most people would like to believe. In fact, it is probably the most accepted, and ignored, form of domestic violence. Here you will find information about the problems associated with this type of domestic violence. Separate sections help parents to recognize sibling abuse and give information on how to intervene if you discover this is happening in your family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holes in the Wall</td>
<td>Child to Parent Violence</td>
<td>Holes in the Wall is a blog by Helen Bonnick, a British Social Worker who has worked with parents who have been the victim of child to parent violence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Abuse Action Coalition</td>
<td>Child to Parent Violence</td>
<td>The Parent Abuse Action Coalition mission is the creation of a coordinated response from federal, state or local government to parent abuse similar to what currently exists for elder abuse regulations; to get legislation submitted in all 50 states and create responsive services for parents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>