

Improving Delinquency Outcomes for Abused and Neglected Children: Changing the Paradigm Through Multi-System Collaboration

Shay Bilchik, *Center for Juvenile Justice Reform, Georgetown University*
John Tuell, *RFK Children's Action Corps/MacArthur Foundation Models for Change Initiative*

Coalition for Juvenile Justice Annual Spring Conference
"Fair and Equal Justice: Alternative Sentences and Sanctions for Youth"
May 23, 2011

Crossover Youth: Key Definitions

- ▶ Crossover Youth=Youths who have experienced maltreatment and engaged in delinquency.
- Dually-Involved Youth=A subgroup of crossover youth who are simultaneously receiving services, at any level, from both the child welfare and juvenile justice systems.
- Dually-Adjudicated Youth=A subgroup of dually-involved youth, encompassing only those youth who are concurrently adjudicated by both the child welfare and juvenile justice systems.

Identifying Dually-Involved Youth: At Least Three Different Pathways

Child Welfare.....Juvenile Justice



A youth in the child welfare system who is subsequently charged with delinquency



A youth entering or in the delinquency system who is identified as being maltreated but has no current contact with the child welfare system



A youth who enters the child welfare system for placement following JJ confinement because no other option is available

3

The Research: Prevalence

- ▶ Limited studies that examine prevalence
- ▶ Studies estimate between 9 and 29% of child welfare youth also have contact with the juvenile justice system (Smith, Thornberry, Ireland, & Elwyn, 2008; Johnson, Ereth, & Wagner, 2004; Dennison & Waterson, 2002)
- ▶ Childhood abuse and neglect increased the odds of future delinquency and adult criminality overall by 29 percent (Widom & Maxfield, 2001)

4

The Research: Prevalence

- ▶ Being abused or neglected as a child increased the likelihood of arrest as a juvenile by 55% and for a violent crime as a juvenile by 96% (Widom, Tuell, & Wiig, 2003)
- ▶ Being abused or neglected as a child increased the likelihood of arrest as an adult by 28% and for a violent crime as an adult by 30% (Update on the Cycle of Violence, 2001)

5

The Research: Characteristics of Crossover Youth

- ▶ At least four studies have examined crossover youth characteristics (Herz & Ryan 2008b; Halemba, Siegel, Lord, & Zawacki 2004; Kelley, Thornberry, & Smith 1997; Saeturn & 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
- ▶ A general profile of these youth is provided next from these studies

6

The Research: Characteristics of Crossover Youth

- ▶ Most are male—although there is a higher percentage of females (33%) than in the general delinquency populations
- ▶ African-Americans are over-represented—this finding was specific to Herz & Ryan and Saeturn & Swain
- ▶ They are likely to have been placed in at least one congregate care setting
- ▶ They are likely to have a number of placement changes while in the care and custody of child welfare

7

The Research: Characteristics of Crossover Youth

- ▶ They are often living in a group home—at least one-third of arrests for crossover youth are related to their placement, and most of these situations occur in a group home placement (this finding was specific to Herz & Ryan, 2008 and Saeturn & Swain, 2009)
- ▶ They are often from families in which one or both parents have a criminal history, a history of substance abuse, and/or a history with mental illness
- ▶ They are often exposed to domestic violence—70% in Halemba et al

8

The Research: Characteristics of Crossover Youth

- ▶ They are likely to experience school-related challenges:
 - They are often truant from school
 - When attending school, they experience poor performance and/or engage in behaviors that result in suspensions or other disciplinary practices
 - They are likely to be eligible for special education services
- ▶ They are suffering from mental health and/or substance abuse problems—often these are co-occurring

9

The Research: System Experiences for Crossover Youth

- ▶ Inconsistent identification of dual system involvement pre-adjudication (Conger & Ross, 2010)
- ▶ More likely to be detained (Conger & Ross, 2010)
- ▶ Halemba et al. (2004) showed higher proportions of crossover youth as penetration of the system deepened—1% of diversion cases, 7% of probation supervision; and 42% of placement cases
- ▶ For disposition, crossover youth were less likely than non-crossover youth to receive “home on probation” (58% v. 73%) and more likely to receive “suitable placement” (i.e., placement in congregate care (21% v. 11%)—Ryan, Herz, Hernandez, & Marshall, 2007)

10

The Research: System Experiences for Crossover Youth

- ▶ 65% of youth correctional exits had a child welfare history prior to entering the correctional facility--9% of youth exits in Illinois and 11% of exits in Chicago were in an out-of-home placement in child welfare one year after exit (Cusick, Goerge, & Bell (2009)
- ▶ More likely to be perceived as higher risk by system personnel and be dissatisfied with representation (Taken from interviews with youth, foster parents, judges and child welfare administrators Morris & Freundlich, 2004)
- ▶ Receiving advocacy from dependency attorney reduced the likelihood of becoming a delinquency ward (Herz, Ryan, and Bilchik, 2010)

The Crossover Youth Practice Model



A practice model is a conceptual map and organizational ideology that includes definitions and explanations regarding how staff partner with families, service providers, and other stakeholders in the delivery of services to achieve positive outcomes for youth and their families

13

Crossover Youth Practice Model: Overarching Goals

- ▶ Reduction in the number of youth placed in out-of-home care
- ▶ Reduction in the use of congregate care
- ▶ Reduction in youth crossing over
- ▶ Reduction in the disproportionate representation of children of color

14

Crossover Youth Practice Model: Supporting Practice Goals

- ▶ Reduction in the use of pre-adjudication detention
- ▶ Increased use of diversion
- ▶ Reduction in the number of youth reentering child welfare from juvenile justice placements
- ▶ Improvement in pro-social bonds
- ▶ Reduction in recidivism

15

Crossover Youth Practice Model: Supporting Process Goals

- ▶ Increased of interagency information-sharing
- ▶ Increased use of “joint” assessment
- ▶ Increased inclusion of youth and family voice in decision-making

16

Crossover Youth Practice Model – The National Picture

National CYPM Sites:

- Denver, CO
- Los Angeles County, CA
- Monroe County, NY
- Hamilton County, OH
- King County, WA
- Miami–Dade County, FL
- Multnomah County, OR
- Philadelphia, PA
- South Carolina (Berkley, Charleston, and Georgetown Counties)
- Travis County, TX
- Woodbury County, IA

17

Crossover Youth Practice Model – The National Picture

- ▶ State Expansions:
 - Oregon (Marion County)
 - Florida (Broward and Polk Counties)
- ▶ State Spreads:
 - Ohio
 - Texas
 - Colorado
- ▶ Certificate Programs for Public Sector and Private Sector Leaders
- ▶ Data and Analysis

18

Crossover Youth Practice Model: Phases and Practice Areas

- ▶ Phase I:
 - Practice Area I: Arrest, Identification, and Detention
 - Practice Area II: Decision-making Regarding Changes

- ▶ Phase II:
 - Practice III: Case Assignment, Assessment, and Planning

- ▶ Phase III:
 - Practice Area IV: Coordinate Case Supervision and Ongoing Assessment
 - Practice Area V: Planning for Youth Permanency, Transition, and Case Closure

19

Key Areas of Activity

1. Preventing Crossing Over
2. Arrest, Detention, Intake/Diversion and Charging
3. Assessment, Case Planning and Management
4. Case Closure and Permanency

20

Preventing Crossing Over

- ◊ Child welfare workers are notified when youth in their care receive warning letters or minor citation tickets (Denver, CO; Portland OR)
- ◊ School officials and child welfare social workers staff cases together in order to reduce referrals into the juvenile justice system (Miami, FL)
- ◊ Group home staff are trained on expectations around placement stability and responses to problem behavior (Bartow, FL)
- ◊ Child welfare and juvenile justice workers are trained to identify behaviors in youth who are at risk for dependency and delinquency (Sioux City, IA)

21

Arrest, Detention, Intake/Diversion and Charging

- ▶ Juvenile justice and child welfare systems work together to identify crossover youth at time of arrest (All sites)
- ▶ Juvenile justice and child welfare systems develop a Memorandum of Agreement:
 - ◊ That establishes case protocols and ensures uniform case management processes (Berkley, Charleston, and Georgetown, SC; Bartow, FL; Rochester, NY)
 - ◊ That allows for the sharing of information (All sites have either created a MOA or utilized existing agreements to ensure information can be exchanged between agencies)

22

Arrest, Detention, Intake/Diversion and Charging

- ▶ Parents are better informed about how the juvenile justice and child welfare systems work together when serving crossover youth through the use of brochures (Sioux City, IA; Miami, FL; Berkley, SC)
- ▶ Juvenile justice and child welfare case workers conduct joint home visits with families to discuss how to best achieve safety, well being and permanency (Charleston, SC; Ft. Lauderdale, FL; Georgetown, SC)
- ▶ Families are engaged in the case decision-making process through family/multi-disciplinary team meetings (Philadelphia, PA; Los Angeles, CA; Cincinnati, OH, Berkley, Charleston, and Georgetown, SC)

23

Arrest, Detention, Intake/Diversion and Charging

- ▶ Inventory of all screening assessments used by both agencies (Denver, CO; Sioux City, IA; Bartow, FL)
- ▶ Introduction of validated screening instruments (Bartow, FL.; Cincinnati, OH)
- ▶ Consider diversion for all crossover youth (Denver, CO; Miami, FL; Sioux City, IA; Travis County, Texas)
- ▶ Identify and share resources to improve services for crossover youth (All sites)
- ▶ Permanency planning begins at arrest and continues throughout life of case (All sites)
 - Use of Family Finding technology (Bartow, FL; Rochester, NY)
 - Permanency roundtables (Denver, CO; Ft. Lauderdale, FL; Miami, FL)

24

Assessment, Case Planning and Management

- ▶ Joint assessment process and collective discussion of case information and assessment outcomes (Charleston, SC; Los Angeles, CA; Miami, FL; Travis County, Texas)
- ▶ Special protocols established to facilitate the staffing of cases by attorneys assigned to crossover youth (Miami, FL; Portland, OR)
- ▶ Consolidated court processing
 - Dedicated Docket (Rochester, NY; Seattle, WA)
 - One family/One judge (Portland, OR)
 - Pre-Court Coordination (Berkley, Charleston, and Georgetown, SC; Miami, FL)
 - Hybrid of Crossover Court for more serious cases and pre-court coordination for less serious cases (Philadelphia, PA)

25

Assessment, Case Planning and Management

- ▶ Creation of integrated case plan focused on reduction of safety threats and risks, increases in parental capacities and youth decision-making (All sites)
- ▶ One agency acts as lead on case management (Cincinnati, OH)
- ▶ Juvenile justice and child welfare case workers attend all court hearings (Bartow, FL; Charleston, SC)
 - Alternatively, case workers conduct joint pre-court case consultations (Portland, OR; Georgetown, SC; Miami, FL, Sioux City, IA)

26

Assessment, Case Planning and Management

- ▶ Coordinated case supervision
 - Specialized crossover units to coordinate case management (Bartow, FL; Ft. Lauderdale, FL)
 - Probation officers with specialized qualifications and/or training (Charleston, SC; Rochester, NY; Sioux City, IA)
- ▶ Reduction in use of congregate care (Ft. Lauderdale, FL; Los Angeles, CA; Sioux City, IA)
- ▶ Increased support for kinship care relatives (Charleston, SC; Rochester, NY; Sioux City, IA)
- ▶ Concurrent permanency planning (Philadelphia, PA; Bartow, FL; Ft. Lauderdale, FL)

27

Crossover Youth Data

- ▶ Three levels of data will be captured by each site:
 - Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice census data
 - Crossover Youth data
 - Individual Youth data

28

Mini-Case Study

29

Improving Delinquency Outcomes for Abused and Neglected Children: Changing the Paradigm Through Multi-System Collaboration

Shay Bilchik, *Center for Juvenile Justice Reform, Georgetown University*
John Tuell, *RFK Children's Action Corps/MacArthur Foundation Models for
Change Initiative*

Coalition for Juvenile Justice Annual Spring Conference
"Fair and Equal Justice: Alternative Sentences and Sanctions for Youth"
May 23, 2011