BACKGROUND

- Research
- Breakthrough Series Collaborative
- Integration of learning
- Development of the CYPM model
DEFINITIONS-PATHWAYS TO BECOMING A CROSSOVER YOUTH

• Pathway 1: Youth who have an open child welfare case and subsequently are arrested and enter the delinquency system.
• Pathway 2: Youth who have a previous but not current child welfare case and are arrested.
• Pathway 3: Youth who are arrested and have no previous history with the child welfare system, but during their involvement with the juvenile justice system they are referred to the child welfare system.
• Pathway 4: Youth who leave correctional placements and have no home or no safe home in which to return. Consequently, these youth are referred to the child welfare system.
THE RESEARCH & CHARACTERISTICS OF CROSSOVER YOUTH

• At least five studies have examined crossover youth characteristics (Herz & Ryan 2008b; Widom & Maxfield 2001; Halemba, Siegel, Lord, & Zawacki 2004; Kelley, Thornberry, & Smith 1997; Saetturn & Swain, 2009).

• Although these studies are not identical in their methodology, they all examine characteristics of crossover youth and report a tremendous amount of similarity.

• All provide evidence that childhood abuse and neglect are associated with an increased risk of crime and violence; it is important to highlight though that this relationship is neither inevitable nor deterministic.
HOW MANY YOUTH IN CHILD WELFARE CROSS OVER INTO DELINQUENCY

Demographics
* Increased likelihood of being female
* More likely to be African-American
* Younger at the age of their first arrest than youth not involved in the child welfare system

Experiences with Abuse/Neglect and the System
* Persistent maltreatment and type
* Type of placement
* Placement instability
* Absence of positive attachments

Between 7% and 30% of Youth Aged 10 or Older in the Care of Child Welfare are Subsequently Arrested

(Note: % is higher when self-reports of maltreatment and delinquency are used)
HOW MANY YOUTH IN THE DELINQUENCY SYSTEM HAVE CHILD WELFARE HISTORIES AND HOW DEEPLY DO THEY PENETRATE THE JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM

• In overall juvenile justice populations, the percentage ranges from 17% to 67% across studies.

• Rates of dual-involvement seem related to how deeply a youth penetrates the juvenile justice system.

Results Taken from Arizona—Halemba et al., 2004
### CHARACTERISTICS OF CROSSOVER YOUTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child Welfare Experiences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Extended period of care with the child welfare system, entering the system as a young child, as well as adolescent maltreatment and system involvement alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Significantly, high number of placement changes during their time in care of the child welfare system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Often, they are living in a group home at the time of arrest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Many youth are not attending school or have attendance problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Many have special education issues that may or may not have been identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Many come from families that have a history of mental illness, substance abuse, domestic violence, and/or criminal behavior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Juvenile Justice Experiences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Slightly less than half of these youth are charged with violent offenses, many of which are assaults (misdemeanor or felony)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• One quarter to one-half were detained at the time of arrest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Many have had prior contact with the system for previous criminal or status offense charges</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CYPM DATA FINDINGS

- Compared to Pre-CYPM Youth, CYPM youth were three times more likely to receive a promising practice. The improved access to promising practices for CYPM Youth was most notable for having an interagency meeting, hearing the case in a one judge/one family courtroom, and being placed in a specialized unit.

- Three-quarters of CYPM Youth were identified at arrest or as a result of a warrant. The majority of remaining youth were identified at charging, which was a focal point for the CYPM work in two sites. This is a significant increase in the percentage of youth identified at an early stage of their crossing over, thereby providing the opportunity for enhanced, cross-system case management.

- CYPM Youth were most likely to receive a diversionary option, probation supervision, or have their case dismissed or no action taken by the juvenile justice system. Compared to Pre-CYPM Youth, CYPM Youth were slightly more likely to be dismissed or receive diversion and less likely to receive probation supervision or placement in corrections.

- Compared to Pre-CYPM Youth, CYPM Youth were less likely to live in congregate care settings.
CYPM DATA FINDINGS

- Compared to Pre-CYPM Youth, a lower percentage of CYPM Youth had Alternative Permanent Planned Living Arrangement (APPLA) as a permanency goal.

- A higher percentage of CYPM Youth had to remain at home as a permanency goal compared to Pre-CYPM Youth.

- CYPM Youth were more likely to have one or both cases closed than Pre-CYPM Youth.

- Contact with family and parents and involvement in extracurricular and structured activities increased for CYPM Youth.

- The percentage of CYPM Youth experiencing academic and/or behavioral problems decreased over time.

- Compared to Pre-CYPM youth, CYPM Youth were more likely to show improvements in mental health.
CYPM: A NATIONAL LOOK AT PRACTICE
Crossover Youth Practice Model sites

Arizona
- Coconino Co.
- Maricopa Co.
- Mohave Co.
- Yavapai Co.

California
- Alameda Co.
- Los Angeles Co.
- San Diego Co.

Colorado
- Broomfield Co.
- Denver Co.
- Douglas Co.
- El Paso Co.
- Gunnison Co.
- Jefferson Co.
- Larimer Co.
- Mesa Co.
- Morgan Co.
- San Luis Valley

Florida
- Bartow
- Brevard Co.
- Duval Co.
- Ft. Lauderdale
- Miami-Dade Co.
- Seminole Co.
- Volusia Co.

Iowa
- Woodbury Co.

Maryland
- Prince George’s Co.

Michigan
- Berrien Co.
- Genesse Co.
- Oakland Co.

Minnesota
- Carver Co.
- Hennepin Co.
- Kandiyohi Co.
- Olmsted Co.
- Stearns Co.

Missouri
- Greene Co.
- Jefferson Co.

New York
- Bronx
- Kings Co.
- Monroe Co.

Ohio
- Carroll Co.
- Clarke Co.
- Cuyahoga Co.

Oklahoma
- Berrien Co.
- Douglas Co.
- Gage Co.
- Lancaster Co.

Oregon
- Lane Co.
- Marion Co.
- Multnomah Co.
- Washington Co.

Pennsylvania
- Allegheny Co.
- Philadelphia

South Carolina
- Berkley Co.
- Charleston Co.
- Georgetown Co.

Texas
- Bexar Co.
- Dallas Co.
- El Paso Co.
- McLennan Co.
- Tarrant Co.
- Travis Co.

Washington
- King Co.

Wyoming
- Laramie Co.
KEY ELEMENTS OF THE MODEL

Systems Level Factors

- Partnering with families and youth
- Information Sharing
- Cross-Systems Collaboration
- Impacting Permanency & Self-Sufficiency
PARTNERING WITH FAMILIES AND YOUTH

• Parents and Youth serving on the Implementation Team and Guiding Coalition

• Engaging a local parent group to assist in the development of the CYPM protocol
INFORMATION SHARING

• Conducting a legal and policy analysis to understand what can be shared and confirming the context in which that sharing can occur

• Creating a Memorandum of Understanding that allows for the sharing of information on a systems level and case level
CROSS-SYSTEMS COLLABORATION

- Developing partnerships across youth serving agencies to improve outcomes for youth
- Engaging non-traditional agencies as stakeholders to this population of youth
- Blending funds to provide alternative supports for youth
IMPACTING PERMANENCY AND SELF-SUFFICIENCY

- Multi-system understanding of the importance of permanency
- All systems playing a role in assisting youth in becoming self-supporting adults
KEY ELEMENTS OF THE MODEL

Case Level Factors
• Identification of youth
• Impacting charging decisions
• Utilizing joint assessment processes
• Coordinated case planning and management
• Judicial oversight
• Achieving permanency and self-sufficiency
### Key Elements of the Model: Case Level Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification of Youth</th>
<th>Impacting Charging Decisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Creating processes to</td>
<td>- Convening a meeting of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identify youth at the point</td>
<td>relevant parties to make a joint decision regarding charges and/or diversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of arrest, detention, or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>juvenile justice intake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### KEY ELEMENTS OF THE MODEL: CASE LEVEL FACTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utilizing joint assessment processes</th>
<th>Coordinated case planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Conducting a family team or multi-disciplinary team meeting to discuss case dynamics and develop a coordinated plan</td>
<td>• Utilizing the information from the joint assessment process to create one plan for the family and youth that is presented to the court</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
KEY ELEMENTS OF THE MODEL: CASE LEVEL FACTORS

**Judicial oversight**
- Dedicated docket
- One Family/One Judge

**Achieving permanency and self sufficiency**
- Ensuring youth have connections to family
- Providing youth opportunities for post-secondary education and/or vocational training
CYPM: THE COLORADO EXPERIENCE
THE COLORADO LANDSCAPE

State Oversight  Local Control

- Potential for wide variability in responses
- Local investment in outcomes
- State-wide initiatives
  - Incentives to collaborate
HISTORY OF COLLABORATION

State-wide initiatives with local control and design

- HB1171
- SB94
- HB1451

Promising Practices

- Family Engagement
- Multidisciplinary Team Decision Making
COLORADO CYPM: COUNTY BY COUNTY

A brief history of CYPM in Colorado

- Denver began its early efforts in 2008
- Denver CYPM 2010
- 3rd cohort underway now
- 10 counties

Court Improvement Program

- Multi-disciplinary approach to improving how the courts handle dependency and neglect cases
- Most CYPM efforts in CO are connected to CIP
BARRIERS/HURDLES/CHALLENGES

Everyone agreed it was a good idea, but we still had our struggles

• Lack of funding
  • We were used to incentives
• Too much collaboration???
• Information sharing
• Identification of Crossover Youth
  • Multiple data systems that don’t talk to each other
• Multiple care/case plans
• Lack of trust
PEOPLE MATTER

Turn-over leads to turn-back

- People matter
  - Get the key leaders on board early
  - Make sure you have a clear vision
  - Permission, permission, permission
  - Train multiple layers of each organization
  - Celebrate the successes
Plan, Do, Study, Act

- Write it down as you go
  - Don’t wait for the “end”
  - Set operating rules, policies, procedures
  - Modify them as you go
  - Create easy to follow checklists
WE’RE STILL LEARNING

• The importance of family engagement
• Unified care/case planning
• We don’t know, what we don’t know
  • Ask, don’t assume
• Size matters
  • Relationships and communication are key
• The role of judges in the process
QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION
CROSSOVER YOUTH PRACTICE MODEL

CJJ CONFERENCE
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