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Outline

• Who are Crossover Youth?
• Which challenges do they face?
• What is the Crossover Youth Practice Model (CYPM)?
• What is CYPM like in the Miami-Dade County?
• What about the comparison county?
• Outcome of CYPM
Who are Crossover Youth?

Child Welfare  Juvenile Justice
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
Which Challenges Do They Face?

- 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.
Demographics of Crossover Youth

- More likely to be female compared to the general delinquency populations
- Minorities are overrepresented
Factors Contributing to the Challenges: Pre-arrest

JJ Involvement

Poor School Performance

Placement Instability

Mental Illness and/or Substance Use
Factors Contributing to the Challenges: Post-arrest

- Deeper Involvement in JJ (e.g., detention, restrictive placement)
- Limited Communication between CW and JJ
- Limited Collaboration between CW and JJ
- Negative Perception of Crossover Youth
Crossover Youth Practice Model (CYPM)

Also called
Georgetown Model

Shay Bilchik

Center for Juvenile Justice Reform
× working across systems of care × georgetown university ✪ gpip policy matters
CYPM Sites: 96 Counties in 21 States
CYPM Procedures

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
Evaluation Design

Experimental Site: Miami-Dade

Control Site: Palm Beach
Conceptual Model

Direct Outcomes
1. Educational, physical and mental health service, and substance use treatment
2. Collaboration between the CW and JJ systems
3. Family engagement

Indirect Outcomes
1. Permanency
2. Continuity of family relationship
3. Juvenile recidivism
1. Compare practice/procedure between two counties
   Qualitative data from:
   – Interview
   – Focus group meeting
   – Observation

2. Within Miami-Dade County, compare pre and post outcomes
   Quantitative data from:
   – Our Kids administrative data, the CBC at MDC
Participants in Qualitative Data Collection

• Delinquency judge who was involved in CYPM from the beginning
• Most participants in the MDT meetings
Compare Practice/Procedure between Two Counties
CYPM in the Miami-Dade County (MDC)
History

• Implemented CYPM in 2010
• In 2012, Ms. Frances P. Allegra, former CEO of Our Kids of Miami-Dade/Monroe, Inc., reports:
  – *CYPM resulted in enhanced data sharing between the child welfare and juvenile justice systems. More specifically, she reported that Our Kids started sharing child welfare data with the juvenile justice system at intake of juvenile arrest and identifying crossover youth in their own system. Between July 2010 and April 2011, Our Kids identified 93% of crossover youth at the time of arrest.*
Timeline of CYPM Implementation in MDC

Juvenile Arrest
- Juvenile services department (JSD) identifies crossover youth.
- JSD sends the list to CYPM participants.

Lawyer Protocol Meetings
- Conference call on the following Tuesday.
- Each case gets 10 minutes to identify the involved professionals, such as names and contact information of case managers and attorney.
- Crossover youth do not participate.

MDT Meetings
- In person meeting on Thursdays with multidisciplinary team (MDT).
- Each case gets an hour.
- Crossover youth MUST be present. Occasionally, if they live in restrictive juvenile justice placement, they participate on phone.
Timeline of CYPM implementation in MDC

Juvenile Arrest
JSD (previously called JAC) Identifies Crossover
MDT Meeting
MDT Meeting Report Sent to Judge
Adjudication Hearing

Should there be MDT meetings at other times?
MDT Participants in MDC

- Unified Family Court
- Public defender
- State attorney
- Family
- Guardian ad Litem
- Juvenile probation officer
- CYPM liaison in Department of Juvenile Justice
- CYPM liaison in contracting agencies
- Case manager in contracting agencies
- Our Kids, CBC
- Crossover Youth
MDT Agenda

1. CYPM liaison in contracting agencies presents a written report on youth demographics, CW history, current school status, mental diagnoses and medication.
2. CYPM liaison in DJJ presents a written report on youth offenses and placement history (i.e., detention, facilities) on the JJ side.
3. CYPM liaison in contracting agencies introduces the purpose.
4. Case manager in contracting agencies reports history and current living arrangement and services arrangement.
5. Multiple parties discuss the progress and barriers for next living and services arrangements.
6. CYPM liaison in DJJ announces the date for adjudication hearing.
7. JPO asks for the contact information of caregivers/guardians.
What Else Should Be on the Agenda?

Engage youth
1. How to deal with their level of understanding?
2. How to deal with their emotions?

Engage family
1. Who are their family?
2. What can family do?
What Else Should Be on the Agenda?

1. More active participation from the state attorney
2. Better understanding of the impacts of trauma and mental illness
3. More information sharing on assessment
4. More information sharing on service providers
5. More information on services planning on the JJ side
Suggested Change to Timeline

Juvenile Arrest

JSD (previously called JAC) Identifies Crossover

MDT Meeting

MDT Meeting Report Sent to Judge

Adjudication Hearing

Should there be MDT meetings at other times?
Crossover Case Management in Palm Beach County (PBC)
• Never adopted CYPM
• However, in January 2012, the Crossover Committee was created to develop a standard operating procedure. Meanwhile, the involved parties signed the MOU.
Crossover Points of Contact in PBC

- Court Administration
- Youth Court
- Public Defender
- State Attorney
- Legal Aid Society
- Guardian ad Litem
- DJJ
- Children’s Legal Services
- Office of Regional Conflict Counsel
- Office of the Clerk and Comptroller
- Conflict Counsel
- DCF
- ChildNet, CBC
Special Cases

• Does not meet the definition for a crossover youth
• Has multisystem involvement
• Would benefit from notification to points of contact
• Will be brought to the next committee meeting
Timeline of the Crossover Case Management in PBC (CW→JJ)

1. Child protective investigation
2. CPS identifies crossover
3. Order setting crossover mandatory case conference (since May 2015)
4. Crossover hearing
Timeline of the Crossover Case Management in PBC (JJ→CW)

- Juvenile arrest
- JAC identifies crossover
- Order setting crossover mandatory case conference (since May 2015)
- Crossover hearing
Distribution between Two Directions

- 77.50% from JJ to CW
- 22.50% from CW to JJ
What Else Has Been Included in the Crossover Case Management in PBC?

1. Provides cross system training.
2. Leadership teams from both sides meet for complex cases to identify available services.
3. For the “Lockout” Abandonment cases, DJJ leads meetings involving points of contact, youth, and their family.
Are the Models of Two Counties Different?

If not, research hypotheses need to change.
Conceptual Model

- CYPM vs. Non-CYPM
- Individual Characteristics
- County Characteristics

**Direct Outcomes**
1. Educational, physical and mental health service, and substance use treatment
2. Collaboration between the CW and JJ systems
3. Family engagement

**Indirect Outcomes**
1. Permanency
2. Continuity of family relationship
3. Juvenile recidivism
Within Miami-Dade County, Compare Pre and Post Outcomes
### Demographics and Arrest (CY 2013 Cohort)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>72.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arrest Categories</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felony</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misdemeanor</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Length of Stay in Placement (Days)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before arrest</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>4919.00</td>
<td>1587.65</td>
<td>1447.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After arrest</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>1166.00</td>
<td>566.02</td>
<td>282.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Number of Placements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Before arrest</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>14.95</td>
<td>10.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>After arrest</strong></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>58.00</td>
<td>14.62</td>
<td>12.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next steps

1. Interview the state attorneys in both counties
2. Obtain merged quantitative data from the State DJJ
3. Analyze data to answer questions on outcome comparisons between two counties:
   1) Do the CYMP participants show better direct outcomes than the non-CYPM participants?
   2) Do the CYMP participants show better indirect outcomes than the non-CYPM participants, as mediated by the direct outcomes?