WASHINGTON STATE PARTNERSHIP COUNCIL ON JUVENILE JUSTICE
WA-PCJJ

Raise the Age Workgroup

Summary Notes
Wednesday, November 13, 2024 | 10 AM-12 PM
Via Microsoft Teams

Welcome & Introductions
Drew Hill welcomed the group and all exchanged introductions.

Attendees: Heidi Sadri, Alexi Castilla, Whitney Queral, Jenny Young, Jose L Caywood, Norrie Gregoire, Mackenzie Crampton, Kolanye Bykoff, Cali Jahn, Judge Jennifer Forbes, Arthur Longworth, Frank Thomas, Paul Daniels, Amity Bjork, Nicholas Oakley, Shanyne Noel, Lael Chester, Andrew Hill

Project Status Updates
Heidi provided project status updates summarized below.

- September workgroup meeting recap:
  - Introduced Cali Jahn and Katya Jardim, additional contracted TA providers from UW EPIC. Heard an overview of the asset mapping and benefit-cost analysis work they will be completing to support our project.
  - Updates from each of our subgroups, where most recommendations are being developed.
  - Presentation by Lael Chester and Selen Perker of EAJP on differences between Raise the Age and Hybrid models and guidance for Washington.
- Subgroups met in October
- Selection of current upcoming activities and project milestones (see slide)

Subgroup Reports

- October subgroup goals (Heidi)
- Subgroup reports (see slides):
  - Community-Based Services Subgroup (Whitney)
  - Court Services & Detention Subgroup (Jenny)
  - Charging & Sentencing Subgroup (Heidi)
  - Juvenile Rehabilitation Subgroup (Alexi)
- Open invitation to join any group(s) of interest

Moving December Subgroup Meetings Offline

- Upcoming requests for offline input and engagement in lieu of December subgroup meetings:
  - Review EPIC asks
  - Review outlined recommendations

- Review juvenile vs. adult system comparison

Updates & Requests for Input: Evans Policy Innovation Collaborative Projects

Cali Jahn of the Evans Policy Innovation Collaborative (EPIC) provided updates and requested input on EPIC's work.

- Asset mapping project: strategy for service provider interviews, service provider categories
- Benefit-cost analysis education and discussion opportunity

Items for Full-Group Discussion

- Possible Recommendation: Phased implementation
  - Why implement in phases?
    - To moderate the impact on caseloads and allow for gradual development/increase in staffing, service provider capacity
    - To create opportunity for assessment of one phase in preparation for the next.
  - Vermont's approach (planned, prior to pandemic and paused implementation): add 18-year-olds 7/1/2020, add 19-year-olds 7/1/2022
  - Possible RTA phased implementation for consideration
  - Future phase (not within the scope of this project/report): Develop and implement a hybrid system for ages 21-26.
    - As described by EAJP researchers, RTA and hybrid models should coexist – it's not one or the other.
    - Beyond the scope of our project, there is a continued need to be responsive to the developmental needs and characteristics of young people up to age 26. We agreed in our last meeting to uplift the potential value of a hybrid model for age 21-26 as a future consideration.
  - Discuss: Is this a reasonable phasing recommendation? What rationale and benefits would we like to provide in our report regarding a phased implementation?
  - Notes/discussion:
    - Our phased approach recommendation to raising the age provides a thoughtful balance between immediate needs and long-term developmentally appropriate goals for the juvenile justice system. By gradually raising the age ceiling—starting with 18-year-olds in Year 1, 19-year-olds in Year 3, and 20-year-olds in Year 5—we can adapt resources and capacities over time to meet the distinct needs of older youth transitioning to adulthood.

- Possible recommendation: Raise the minimum age
  - Do we want to make a recommendation regarding the minimum age?

        - There are benefits and drawbacks to if and how we address the minimum age. There are also implications for how our other recommendations imagine the future.
        - We would not be developing recommendations about how to raise the minimum age, but we could comment on sequencing/priority
    - Activity exploring benefits/opportunities and challenges/drawbacks
    - Notes:
        - If min age is raised, it could impact the system in an unknown way. The legislature needs to decide something, and it would have an interaction with RTA.
        - Lay out these options without making a recommendation
        - Min age should have already been raised with resources and systems in place. Don't want to delay ours any further, though.
        - Phasing of ceiling could help prepare/complement raise the floor.
        - There are effective services and interventions that can benefit 12/13 year-olds. In many counties, those are only available through a court diversion – that should not be the case. Research shows that 12/13s do not "need" a court intervention to avoid showing up again. They should be accessed and provided in a separate system.
        - We acknowledge the complex considerations involved in raising the age of the floor, recognizing both the potential benefits of a more family-centered approach for younger youth and the challenges it may present, such as limiting the use of diversion.
        - We remain committed to pushing forward our recommendations to raise the age ceiling beyond 18, as doing so allows us to provide developmentally appropriate support for older youth and young adults, acknowledging that their unique needs extend well beyond traditional juvenile age limits. This approach better supports their transition into stable adulthood and aligns with our goals for a responsive, age-appropriate system, and should not be delayed.
        - A developmentally appropriate response tailors support by age groups—shifting youth under 14 to a family-centered approach that emphasizes family involvement, and providing targeted services for ages 14-17, 18-21, and 22-25, recognizing each group's unique needs and transitions. This phased approach fosters stronger family connections for younger youth while supporting older groups with age-specific resources to navigate independence and adulthood successfully.
        - When systems are family-centered, they recognize that families are integral to a young person's development and well-being, viewing them as partners rather than passive participants. This approach emphasizes collaboration with families to create supportive environments, valuing their insights and knowledge as essential to designing effective interventions. Family-centered systems aim to

empower families by providing resources and education to strengthen family bonds, enhance resilience, and support family stability, understanding that a healthy family dynamic contributes significantly to positive outcomes for youth.

- Such systems also adapt services to meet the unique needs of each family, acknowledging diversity in family structures, values, and experiences. They often include flexible, accessible resources that allow families to be actively involved in treatment and decision-making processes. In essence, family-centered systems foster trust and build bridges between service providers and families, creating a collaborative network that supports both the youth and their family as a whole.

Next Steps

Conclude

Next Meeting:
Wednesday, January 8, 2025 | 2-4 PM