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Who We Are: Center for Juvenile Justice Reform

For more information:
http://cjjr.georgetown.edu

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.
## Who We Are: Center for Juvenile Justice Reform

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CJJR Overview</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crossover Youth Practice Model</td>
<td>Juvenile Justice Leadership Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth in Custody Practice Model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Coordinated Assistance to States</td>
<td>Juvenile Justice System Improvement Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate Programs</td>
<td>Public Information Officers Learning Collaborative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(LGBTQ Youth; Reducing Racial and Ethnic Disparities; School Justice Partnerships and Diversion Pathways; Youth in Custody; Evidence-Based Decision-Making)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Advances in Juvenile Justice
Policy and Practice
The Ecological Model: **Nesting Theory**

Youth “nest” within multiple settings that impact behavior, such as:

- Communities
- Schools
- Peer Groups
- Families
- Individual

Bronfenbrenner’s theory of social ecology (1979)
Advances in Juvenile Justice Over Time

• Increasing knowledge in Juvenile Justice – “What Works”

• Promoting **effective, evidence-based** juvenile justice programming and policy
  
  ✓ The use of risk and needs assessment tools
  
  ✓ The need for strong diversion programs for low risk/level offenders
  
  ✓ The importance of keeping youth in the community and close to home (i.e., receiving quality services at the appropriate level of supervision)
    
    • Implementing evidence-based services
    
    • Youth and family-centered
  
  ✓ Addressing racial and ethnic disproportionality in the juvenile justice system
Visualizing the Evidence-Based Decision-Making
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Source: Center for Juvenile Justice Reform
Crossover Youth
Characteristics and
Outcomes
CROSSOVER YOUTH: DEFINITIONS

- Crossover Youth
- Dually-Involved Youth
- Dually-Adjudicated Youth
Characteristics of Crossover Youth:
General Demographics

☑ Increased likelihood of being female compared to justice-only youth (Herz et al., 2019; Sickmund et al., 2017)
  - Girls represent **29%** of juvenile court cases and between **30-50%** of CY cases

☑ More likely to be African-American (Herz et al., 2019; Child Welfare Information Gateway, 2017; Sickmund et al., 2017)
  - African-American youth are **16%** of the general population but account for **35%** of juvenile court cases and **24%** of foster care youth
  - African-American CY found to **double in rate** compared to representation in just JJ and CW

☑ High proportion of LGBQ/GNCT (Herz et al., 2019; Irvine & Canfield, 2017)
  - **20%** of CY identify as LGBQ/GNCT
  - 13.6% of CY males and 39.3% of CY females identified as LGBQ/GNCT
  - More than twice as likely to be removed from the home compared to heterosexual peers
  - **Seven times more likely** to be placed in a foster or group home

☑ Increased chance of qualifying for special education (Herz et al., 2019; Leone & Weinberg, 2012)
  - CY youth tend to have learning and behavioral challenges that result in academic and disciplinary struggles
  - Truancy and school mobility also present issues and **bolster likelihood of drop-out**
Characteristics of Crossover Youth: 

Psychosocial

- Dierkhising et al. (2018) found that 31% of a sample of 718 CY in LA experienced **suicidal ideation or attempted suicide**

- CY experience **higher levels of substance use** than justice only involved youth
  - Halemba et al. (2004) reported over 75% of CY had a history of substance use across four Arizona counties
  - Herz & colleagues (2018) found that roughly 70% of CY in LA had histories of substance use

- More likely to have mental health challenges
  - Herz et al. (2018) found approximately **75% of CY** in LA had a diagnosed mental health disorder

- Increased likelihood of familial mental health and substance use histories (Lee & Villagrana, 2015)

- Most common psychosocial-related causes for inpatient hospital care are mood, psychotic, attention, & conduct disorders (CIDI, 2015)
Characteristics of Crossover Youth: Child Welfare Involvement

- Histories of physical abuse, sexual abuse, and neglect are all related to CY (Herz et al., 2019; Irvine & Canfield, 2016)
  - Abuse occurring during adolescence increases likelihood of delinquent behavior (Huang et al., 2015)

- High rate of out-of-home placements (Herz et al., 2019)
  - Often placed in congregate care

- Frequent placement changes compared to non-CY (Herz et al., 2019)
  - LA County (CA): CY experienced an average of 8 placement changes (Herz, 2016)
  - King County (WA): CY experienced an average of 12 placement changes (Halemba & Siegel, 2011)

- Less likely to form prosocial bonds with peers and adults (Huang et al., 2015)

- More likely to have longer stays in child welfare system than child welfare-only involved youth (Herz et al., 2019)
Characteristics of Crossover Youth: Juvenile Justice Involvement

- **Less than ½** charged with violent offenses (Herz & Fontaine, 2013)
  - Usually related to incidents at home, in group homes, or at school

- **Detained at higher rates** than non-child welfare involved youth with similar charges (Herz et al., 2019)
  - Lack of parent/guardian to pick up youth
  - Caretaker refuses to have youth return to placement
  - No known place to release youth to

- **Less likely to be considered for diversion** (Halemba et al., 2004)

- **More likely to receive out-of-home** placement at disposition than non-child welfare involved youth (Herz et al., 2019)

- **Typically younger** at the age of their first arrest than youth not involved in child welfare (Herz et al., 2019)
Outcomes Related to Crossover Youth:

**Recidivism**

- More likely to recidivate in **both** the juvenile and adult justice systems as compared to those solely involved in the justice system (CIDI, 2015; Herz et al., 2019)

- CIDI (2015) study in NYC examined recidivism and subsequent placement of CY and justice-only youth
  - **Adult Jail**: 57.1% of CY recidivists vs. 44.8% justice-only
  - **Jail → State prison**: 25.2% of CY recidivists vs. 20.0% justice-only
  - CY also had **longer and more frequent stays** in the adult system than justice-only involved youth

- Longer history of involvement with child welfare increases the likelihood of recidivism (Halemba & Siegel, 2011)
Outcomes Related to Crossover Youth:

Access to Service

Culhane et al. (2011) examined discrepancies between service referral and access for crossover youth in Los Angeles

- **74% referred to individual therapy**
  - Only 55% accessed this service

- **43% referred to academic tutoring**
  - Only 17% accessed this service

- **33% referred for medication monitoring**
  - Only 15% accessed this service
  - Just 50% of the youth who were prescribed a psychotropic medication were found to actually take their medication
Outcomes Related to Crossover Youth: Public Service Utilization

Culhane et al.’s (2011) LA-based study examining outcomes for crossover youth was replicated by CIDI (2015) in NYC

- Involvement with public services (e.g., homeless shelters, justice, foster care, financial assistance, and health services) between 1 to 6 years post-discharge

  - 94% (NYC) and 88% (LA) of CY utilized at least one service
  - 80% (NYC) and 78% (LA) of CY utilized two or more services
  - 49% of CY in NYC and LA utilized three or more services
Outcomes Related to Crossover Youth: 
Financial Impact

CIDI (2015) compared the cost of accessed public services across CY cases and those solely involved in the justice or child welfare system.

- Average cumulative cost across service areas for CY was 40% higher ($65,424) than those only involved in the justice ($47,854) or foster care ($46,670) systems.
A Multi-Systems Approach: The Crossover Youth Practice Model (CYPM)
System Challenges to Improving Outcomes for Youth

### Information Sharing
- Interpretation of the laws
- Err on the side of “caution”
- Misunderstanding of systems’ functions

### Integrated Data Systems
- Bifurcated systems (i.e., child welfare, State agency; juvenile justice, county agency; multiple school districts)
- Costly
- Concerns about data misuse

### Identification of Youth
- No collaboration if we do not know with whom the youth is connected
CYPM Phases of Practice

Phase I
- Arrest, Identification, and Detention
- Decision-Making Regarding Charges

Phase II
- Joint Assessment and Planning

Phase III
- Coordinated Case Management and Ongoing Assessment
- Planning for Youth Permanency, Transition, and Case Closure

Systemic processes that are enhanced or developed to support youth who move between child welfare and juvenile justice.
CYPM Training & Technical Assistance

- Site-Based TTA to support implementation of the Model
  - Policy, practices, training, performance measures, and quality assurance
- Peer-to-peer learning
- Access to web-based tools and technologies within the network
- Utilization and implementation of the CYPM research toolkit to evaluate outcomes
- Assistance with state-level policy development
Documented CYPM Outcomes

**Reductions In:**
- ✔ Recidivism in justice system
- ✔ New sustained juvenile justice petitions
- ✔ Use of pre-adjudication detention
- ✔ Use of APPLA as a permanency goal

**Increases In:**
- ✔ Improved educational outcomes
- ✔ Pro-social activities
- ✔ Positive behavioral health outcomes
- ✔ Diversion/dismissal
- ✔ Home placement/reunification
- ✔ Social supports

Haight et al. (2016); Herz et al. (2018); Wright et al. (2017)
**CYPM Jurisdictions**

**CYPM in the USA: 23 States, 119 Jurisdictions**

- **Arizona**
  - Apache Co.
  - Cochise Co.
  - Coconino Co.
  - Gila Co.
  - Graham Co.
  - Greenlee Co.
  - La Paz Co.
  - Maricopa Co.
  - Navajo Co.
  - Pima Co.
  - Pinal Co.
  - Santa Cruz Co.
  - Yavapai Co.
  - Yuma Co.

- **Colorado**
  - Colorado (cont.)
    - Mesa Co.
    - Mineral Co.
    - Morgan Co.
    - Rio Grande Co.
    - Saguache Co.

- **Florida**
  - Brevard Co.
  - Broward Co.
  - Duval Co.
  - Miami-Dade Co.
  - Marion Co.
  - Polk Co.
  - Seminole Co.
  - Volusia Co.

- **Idaho**
  - Bannock Co.
  - Oneida Co.
  - Power Co.

- **Iowa**
  - Woodbury Co.

- **Kansas**
  - Sedgwick Co.

- **Maryland**
  - Allegany Co.
  - Carroll Co.
  - Frederick Co.
  - Harford Co.
  - Howard Co.
  - Prince George’s Co.
  - Montgomery Co.
  - Washington Co.

- **Michigan**
  - Berrien Co.
  - Genesee Co.
  - Oakland Co.
  - Wayne Co.

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

- **Missouri**
  - Camden Co.
  - Cass Co.
  - Greene Co.
  - Jefferson Co.
  - Johnson Co.
  - Laclede Co.
  - Miller Co.
  - Moniteau Co.
  - Morgan Co.

- **Nebraska**
  - Dodge Co.
  - Douglas Co.
  - Gage Co.
  - Lancaster Co.
  - Sarpy Co.

- **New York**
  - Bronx Co.
  - Kings Co.
  - Monroe Co.
  - New York Co.
  - Queens Co.
  - Richmond Co.

- **Ohio**
  - Carroll Co.
  - Clarke Co.
  - Cuyahoga Co.
  - Franklin Co.
  - Hamilton Co.
  - Lucas Co.
  - Mahoning Co.
  - Montgomery Co.
  - Ross Co.
  - Stark Co.
  - Summit Co.
  - Trumbull Co.

- **Oregon**
  - Clackamas Co.
  - Douglas Co.
  - Jackson Co.
  - Lane Co.
  - Marion Co.
  - Multnomah Co.
  - Washington Co.

- **Pennsylvania**
  - Allegheny Co.
  - Philadelphia Co.

- **South Carolina**
  - Berkeley Co.
  - Charleston Co.

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

- **Virginia**
  - City of Alexandria

- **Washington**
  - King Co.

- **Wyoming**
  - Laramie Co.
External Evaluations: University of Minnesota Studies

Haight et al. (2016)
- Evaluated CYPM efforts in a Minnesota county
  - **Key finding:** Youth who participated in CYPM had a lower likelihood of recidivism compared to a matched group receiving ‘business as usual,’ even when controlling for variables such as location and time.

Haight et al. (2014)
- Conducted a study on the experiences of professionals in five Minnesota CYPM sites
  - **Key finding:** 99% of CYPM participants reported positive, structural changes in service delivery
External Evaluations: University of Nebraska-Omaha

**Case Processing Outcomes**
- Increased # of youth diverted or dismissed
- Increased # of delinquency & dependency case closures
- Reduced # of new sustained JJ petitions

**Social/Behavioral Outcomes**
- Better living situation 9 months after identification
- Fewer group home/congregate care and detention/correctional placements
- Improved pro-social behavior

**Recidivism Outcomes**
- Fewer # of new arrests 9 months after identification
- Longer time to recidivate
- Arrested for less serious offenses

**Cost Benefit Analysis**
- Estimated annual savings of over $170,000 per year in Douglas County, NE

(Wright, Spohn, & Chenane, 2017)
External Evaluations: California Evidence-Based Clearinghouse

CEBC (2018)

☑ CYPM was designated as having “Promising Research Evidence” with a rating of 3 out of 5 based on aforementioned studies

☑ Relevance to Child and Family Well-Being was deemed High for CYPM
MSI Certificate Program

Expansion of CYPM

CYPM in Sedgwick
Questions and Answers

Haight et al. (2016); Herz et al. (2018); Wright et al. (2017)
For more information, log onto: https://cjjr.georgetown.edu

Contact: Shay Bilchik at scb45@georgetown.edu
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