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The Center for Juvenile Justice Reform supports leadership development and advances a balanced, multi-systems approach to reducing juvenile delinquency that promotes positive child and youth development, while also holding youth accountable.
TODAY’S PRESENTATION

- Crossover Youth
- Crossover Youth Practice Model (CYPM)
- CYPM Key Practice Areas
- CYPM Data Findings
- Development and Status of CYPM in Maricopa Co. Arizona
CROSSOVER YOUTH
CROSSOVER YOUTH: DEFINITIONS

Crossover Youth

Dually-Involved Youth

Dually-Adjudicated Youth
CROSSOVER YOUTH PATHWAYS

Pathway 1: Open CW case with subsequent delinquency referral or arrest

Pathway 2: Previous but not current CW case at time of new delinquency referral or arrest

Pathway 3: Upon JJ investigation after delinquency occurs, maltreatment discovered → referral to CW

Pathway 4: Term of correctional placement ends, but no home/safe home to return to → referral to CW
Studies estimate that between 9 and 29% of child welfare involved youth have contact with the juvenile justice system.

Higher proportion of crossover youth as penetration in the juvenile justice system deepens:

- 1% Diversion Cases
- 7% Probation Cases
- 42% Placement Cases

Sources: Smith, Thornberry, Ireland, & Elwyn, 2008; Johnson, Ereth, & Wagner, 2004; Dennison & Waterson, 2002; Halemba 2004.
WHO ARE THE YOUTH WHO 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 child welfare

Experiences with Abuse/Neglect and the Child Welfare System
- Persistence or adolescent maltreatment, alone
- Type of maltreatment
- Type and # of placements
- Absence of positive attachments
CHARACTERISTICS OF CROSSOVER YOUTH

Individual Characteristics
- Truancy, drop-out, and push-out
- Special education issues that may or may not have been identified
- Parents and youth with history of mental illness, substance abuse, domestic violence, and/or criminal behavior

Juvenile Justice Involvement
- Less than ½ charged with violent offenses
- 1/4 to 1/2 detained at the time of arrest
- Prior contact with the system for previous criminal or status offense charges
CHARACTERISTICS: MENTAL HEALTH AND SUBSTANCE ABUSE PROBLEMS

EXPERIENCES IN THE JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM

Pre-Adjudication
Inconsistent identification; More likely to be detained

Charging
System personnel perceive Dually-Involved Youth as higher risk; Less likely to receive diversion

Disposition
Less likely to receive probation supervision and more likely to receive placement in a group home setting

Higher proportion of crossover youth

LONG TERM OUTCOMES

• Higher rates of substance abuse and mental illness
• Higher recidivism rates
• Higher rates of criminal involvement as adults
• Higher rates of child welfare involvement as parents/perpetrators of maltreatment
Developmental models that highlight the long-term consequences of early trauma may overestimate its impact and underestimate sources of resilience.

These results do not suggest, in any way, that childhood maltreatment is not a serious problem.

Treatment and services must be provided in a coordinated and coherent manner that reduces risk & enhances protection.

**Imperative that we focus on adolescents who experience maltreatment.**
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.
### WHAT DOES A PRACTICE MODEL DO?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What Does It Do?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Makes an explicit link connecting the agency’s policy and practice with its mission, vision, and core values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describes the outcomes to be achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is prescriptive in how services should be provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes the practice activities and rationale that form the case management process opening to closing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes “evidence based” approaches, promising practices and/or approaches believed to be effective through practice based experience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CYPM GOALS

Overarching Goals

- Reduction in:
  - Number of youth placed in out-of-home care
  - Use of congregate care
  - Disproportionate representation of children of color
  - Number of youth crossing over and becoming dually involved
## CYPM GOALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice Goals</th>
<th>Process Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Reduction of use of pre-adjudication detention</td>
<td>• Increase use of interagency information-sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase use of diversion</td>
<td>• Increase use of “joint” case assessment, planning and management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reduction of number of youth reentering child welfare from juvenile justice placements</td>
<td>• Increase inclusion of youth and family voice in decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improvement in pro-social bonds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reduction in recidivism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Practice Area 1: Arrest, Identification, and Detention

Practice Area 2: Decision-making Regarding Charges

Practice Area 3: Case Assignment, Assessment, and Planning

Practice Area 4: Coordinated Case Supervision and Ongoing Assessment

Practice Area 5: Planning for Youth Permanency, Transition, and Case Closure
A plan and/or curriculum has been developed for training all staff involved.

All of the practice changes have been included in current policy and procedure manuals.

Supervisors in both agencies are clear that it is their responsibility to sustain crossover youth practice through personal evaluation and quality assurance.
The findings summarize the Baseline Data and Dually-Involved Youth Data received from sites from the beginning of data collection for CYPM (July 2010 for most sites) through January 2013, including one-year follow-up.

Summary of Dually-Involved Youth by Pathways across CYPM Youth and Comparison Youth (N=1,251)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CYPM Youth (N=917)</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pathway 1: Open Child Welfare Case with Subsequent Delinquency</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathway 1: Youth with a status offense</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathway 2-4: All other pathways</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CYPM Individual Youth (N=334)</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pathway 1: Open Child Welfare Case with Subsequent Delinquency</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathway 1: Youth with a status offense</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathway 2-4: All other pathways</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-CYPM Youth (N=170)</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pathway 1: Delinquent Youth</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Improvements as a Result of The CYPM

- Compared to Pre-CYPM Youth, CYPM youth were three times more likely to receive a promising practice.
- Three-quarters of CYPM Youth were identified at arrest or as a result of a warrant.
- 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.
Improvements as a Result of the CYPM

- 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 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.
DEVELOPMENT AND STATUS OF CYPM IN MARICOPA CO. ARIZONA
State of Arizona Capstone Project

Participating Team

- Honorable Craig Blakey, Associate Presiding Judge, Juvenile Division, Superior Court of Arizona, Maricopa County
- Chad Campbell, Director, Juvenile Justices Services Division, Administrative Office of the Courts
- Caroline Lautt-Owens, Director, Dependent Children’s Services Division, Administrative Offices of the Courts
- Jim Lovett, Arizona Department of Education
- Eric Meaux, Chief Probation Officer, JPD, Maricopa County
- Stacey Reinstein, Deputy Child Welfare Administrator, Department of Economic Security, Division of Children Youth and Families.
- Beth Rosenberg, Director of Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice, Children’s Action Alliance
- Dr. Sara Salek, Medical Director of Children Services, Division of Behavioral Health Services
- Katrina Suell, Community Services Administration, Arizona Department of Juvenile Corrections.
FROM CAPSTONE TO COLLABORATION

Transition from the Capstone to the partnership between Maricopa County and Georgetown University to implement a cross systems practice model in Maricopa County.
Crossover Youth Court at Durango

- Creation of Designated Court to Address Dually Adjudicated Youth

- The target population is crossover youth who are, or have recently been, involved in both the child welfare and juvenile justice systems.

- Collaborative efforts with the Juvenile Court, Education, Juvenile Probation, Child welfare agencies, behavioral health agencies and Law enforcement.
Introduction of the Crossover Youth Practice Model To Stakeholders in Maricopa County

Initial meeting

- Attorneys
- Juvenile Court Staff
- Juvenile Probation Department
- Community Agencies
- Education
- Behavioral Health Sectors
Creating the Maricopa County Infrastructure
May 21st and August 13th Site Visits
Implementation Team

- AHCCCS
- Arizona Children’s Association
- Arizona Department of Juvenile Corrections
- Arizona Juvenile Justice Commission
- Arizona Office of the Courts
- Attorneys
- CASA
- Casey Families
- Child Welfare Agencies – CPS
- DBHS – Magellan Behavioral Health
- Education
- Family Involvement Center
- Guardian ad litem
- Juvenile Court
- Juvenile Probation
- Law Enforcement
- Native Health
Creating the Maricopa County Infrastructure
May 22nd
Guiding Coalition

- Arizona Children’s Action Alliance
- Arizonans for Children
- Arizona’s Children
- ASU Sandra Day O’Connor College of Law
- ASU Juvenile Law Clinic
- ASU School of Social Work
- Attorneys
- Boys and Girls Clubs of Phoenix
- CASA
- Casey Families
- Children’s Action Alliance
- DBHS – Magellan Health Services
- Dropout Prevention & Recovery
- Family Involvement Center
- Gila River Indian Community
- Governor’s Office for Children Youth & Family
- Kinship Services Arizona’s
- Maricopa County Crimes Prevention
- Native Health
- New Pathway for Youth
- Prevent Child Abuse Arizona
- South Mountain Community College
- Tumbleweed Center
- Youth Development Institute
- YWCA
On-Going Collaboration

- Introduction of GAP analysis (blueprint) to the implementation team. Stakeholders at the May 21st site visit developed a work plan and are continually revising the work-plan through new sub-committees.

- Regular communication via email updates sent to all members of Implementation Team and Guiding Coalition regarding status of project (sharing of resources, current information and updates on subcommittees’ work).

- Local meetings held regularly with Juvenile Court, key stakeholders, sub-committees and leads.

- Monthly Teleconference Support and Guidance Conference Calls with Georgetown Research Team.

Future Site Visits:

Guiding Coalition
- November 18th 3:00 p.m.– 4:30 p.m.

Implementation Team
- November 19th 8:30 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.
Target Population

- Youth between the ages of 8-17 currently active with the delinquency system, limited to those youth with a history of 1 or 2 misdemeanor or felony referrals within the last two years, who subsequently have a dependency referral resulting in either voluntary or involuntary services.

- Youth involved in the child welfare system (voluntary or involuntary) who subsequently have a referral to the delinquency system for an alleged delinquency, limited to their 1st or 2nd misdemeanor or felony referral within the last two years.
Desired Outcomes

- Safety, permanency and well being of youth which results in a safe community in Maricopa County and throughout the State of Arizona

- To develop models that increase cross-system communications and more efficiently deliver services in order to achieve positive outcomes for youth and their families

- To build a multi-systems approach that will give us effective tools for dealing with crossover or dually adjudicated youth

- To assist educators with the identification of at risk youth, resulting in earlier intervention

- To reduce the number youth in out-of-home placement

- To reduce the number of youth in congregate care

- To reduce the number of youth crossing over and/or becoming dually adjudicated
The Maricopa County Strategy

- To serve every child individually based on their history and experiences, seeking to achieve a sense of normalcy for all youth on a daily basis.

- To ensure authentic, intentional, and meaningful involvement of youth and families in policy and practice development, service planning and delivery.

- To use an integrated approach between juvenile justice, child welfare, the courts, education, behavioral health and law enforcement, believing that partnerships are the best way to meet the needs of crossover youth and their families.

- To practice and guarantee fair and equitable treatment for all youth and families regardless of race, ethnicity, and national origin. Service delivery honors and respects the beliefs and values of all families.

- To ensure that all youth are provided a safe, nurturing, and permanent family environment and community, the most advantageous place for youth to grow up is in their own home. When immediate family is not available, other viable extended family and community resources will be identified.

- Youths and families have strengths, and systems must learn about and use those strengths in order to effectively meet their needs.
Formation of Maricopa County CYPM Sub-Committees

- Information Sharing Sub-Committee
- Target population and Prevalence Sub-Committee
- Mapping Sub-Committee
- State level Protocols Sub-Committee
- Local level Protocols Sub-Committee
- Prevention and Education Sub-Committee
- Sub-Committee members to join JDAI Committee
- Diversion Eligible Sub-Committee
- Joint Assessment and Case planning Sub-Committee
Collaboration with ASU Advocacy Clinic

- ASU Advocacy Clinic students appointed as advisors for dual ward cases

- Students meet with families, youth, school officials, juvenile probation and child welfare representatives and report to the court on behalf of the youth
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