



A Literature Review of Research on Crossover Youth



JULY 2014

Introduction

Children and youth involved in the child welfare system all too often become involved in the juvenile system, or vice-versa, children in the juvenile system end-up in the child welfare system. Collectively referred to as crossover youth, this population requires a more intense array of services and supports than youth known to the child welfare and juvenile justice systems individually.

United Community Services of Johnson County (UCS) was awarded a 10th Judicial District Court Domestic Violence Special Program Fee Grant to perform a literature review of evidence-based practices and policies that demonstrate success with intervening and preventing children in the child welfare system (e.g. determined by courts as Children in Need of Care) from crossing over to the juvenile justice system. In its review, UCS found a wealth of research that goes beyond intervention and prevention of crossover from child welfare to juvenile justice, to include children who are dually adjudicated.

The findings from this review are provided to the Johnson County Criminal Justice Coordinator, the Juvenile Detention Alternative Initiative (JDAI) and the Johnson County Criminal Justice Advisory Council (CJAC) in hopes of moving forward policies and practices that involve multiple systems beyond just child welfare and juvenile justice in the effort to help crossover children and youth to succeed.

About United Community Services of Johnson County

For more than 40 years UCS has spearheaded efforts to make vital human services available to individuals and families in Johnson County, especially those facing challenges. This neutral, nonprofit organization brings together human service providers, policymakers, funders and community leaders to address issues impacting the well-being of residents. These partnerships ensure that the collective human service impact in Johnson County is far greater than the accomplishments individual organizations can achieve working alone. In addition to providing leadership for community-based planning, UCS provides information and trend analysis while playing a vital role in securing funding for the area's human service organizations. UCS is United Way of Greater Kansas City's Planning Partner in Johnson County.

Questions about the *Literature Review of Research on Crossover Youth* should be directed to its author, UCS Community Initiatives Director Marya Schott, maryas@ucsjoco.org.

Photo Credits:

Cover Photo - © Douglas Dickens | [Dreamstime Stock Photos](#)
Inside Photo - © [Ragne Kabanova](#) | [Dreamstime Stock Photos](#)

Key Findings from Literature Review on Crossover Youth

Children and youth who are known to both the child welfare system and the juvenile justice system are often referred to as crossover youth. These young people move between the two systems, or are known to both concurrently. A broader definition of crossover youth is youth who are not known to either system, but they have been abused or neglected, and engaged in delinquent behavior.

Most often crossover occurs from the child welfare system to the juvenile justice system. Girls make that type of crossover more often than boys, and there is a higher crossover rate for children of color. Data from studies of the prevalence of crossover youth vary. According to the Center for Juvenile Justice Reform, nationally between seven percent and 30 percent of youth aged 10 or older who are in foster care later become involved in the juvenile justice system; and, in overall juvenile justice populations, the percentage of youth who have been in the child welfare system ranges from 17 to 67 percent.¹

Two national think-tanks focus on crossover youth: 1) John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation which established the Models for Change: Systems Reform in Juvenile Justice, and the Models for Change Resource Center Partnership; and 2) Center for Juvenile Justice Reform (CJJR), within Georgetown University, which partners with the Casey Foundation and developed the Crossover Youth Practice Model.

According to the CJJR, there is no research related to the effectiveness of programs with crossover youth specifically. The Youth Crossover Practice Model itself and recommended practices within it are derived from the current research about what works best for youth.

Both the Youth Crossover Practice Model and the Models for Change emphasize the necessity of a multi-system collaboration to comprehensively address the risks and needs of crossover youth. At a minimum, such efforts require the use of coordinated case assignment between child welfare and juvenile justice, joint assessment, coordinated case plans, and coordinated case supervision. Further, the integration of best practices and evidence-based programs as they relate to child welfare, juvenile justice, mental health, substance abuse and education, is key.

To address the crossover population, communities must make strategic decisions about multi-system collaboration, and the investment and sustainability of resources.

About this Report

This report cites research by the Center for Juvenile Justice Reform and the Models for Change Partnership, as well as other sources. It includes examples of how other communities have successfully addressed the crossover population, as well as policy recommendations and recommendations for next steps. The appendix includes a list of elements recommended in the Youth Crossover Practice Model, “Recommended Practices and Products for Handling Dual Status Youth,” a list of suggested resources, and results of program searches on two websites – Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development and SAMHSA National Registry of Evidence Based Programs.

About Crossover Youth

Definition and Cause

A crossover youth is any youth who has experienced maltreatment and engaged in delinquency. This broad definition refers to youth with such experiences, regardless of whether maltreatment and/or delinquency have come to attention of child welfare and/or delinquency systems. The crossover population as a whole generally requires a more intense array of services and supports than other youth known to each system individually.²

Nationally, going from the child welfare system to the juvenile justice system is the dominant path of crossing over. While the exact number of crossover youth varies across jurisdictions, research has established that youth who have been maltreated are more likely to engage in delinquent behavior. Being abused or neglected as a child increases a person's likelihood of arrest as a juvenile by 59 percent, as an adult by 28 percent, and for a violent crime by 30 percent.³

According to the Center for Juvenile Justice Reform, between 7 percent and 30 percent of youth aged 10 or older who are involved in child welfare are subsequently arrested. Further, in overall juvenile justice populations, the percentage of youth who have been in child welfare ranges from 17 percent to 67 percent across studies. Nationally, females crossover at higher rates than males, and there is a higher rate of crossover for children of color. Crossover youth have high rates of mental health and substance abuse problems. Over three-quarters of these youth exhibit symptoms or have diagnosis for a mental health disorder and/or substance abuse.⁴

According to the Urban Institute Justice Policy Center, a large body of research suggests abuse is the most important factor in determining female juvenile delinquency. National studies found 81 percent of female delinquents were victims of physical abuse, 56 percent were victims of sexual abuse, and 88 percent were victims of emotional abuse. Some behaviors that lead to girls' involvement in the juvenile justice system could be interpreted as rational coping strategies rather than deviant behavior (such as running away and removing themselves from abusive behaviors).⁵

Factors in systems that contribute to young people crossing over are lack of placement stability (multiple foster homes), absence of social bonds (missed opportunities to develop social skills), and challenges in education (move around; change schools).⁶



Research from National Leaders

Two national think-tanks focus on crossover youth: 1) John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation which established the Models for Change: Systems Reform in Juvenile Justice, and the Models for Change Resource Center Partnership; and, 2) Center for Juvenile Justice Reform, within

Georgetown University, which partners with the Casey Foundation and developed the Crossover Youth Practice Model.

MacArthur Foundation - Models for Change Resource Center Partnership

The Models for Change Resource Center Partnership includes four resource centers that address four important issues in juvenile justice:

1. Mental health: The National Center for Mental Health and Criminal Justice.
2. Legal defense for indigent youth: National Juvenile Defender Center.
3. Coordinated systems of care for youth who are in both juvenile justice and child welfare systems: The Robert F. Kennedy National Resource Center for Juvenile Justice, led by Robert F. Kennedy Children's Action Corps.
4. Interventions for youth charged with status offenses: The Status Offense Reform Center led by the Vera Institute.

Collaboration, a Critical Element

Increasingly crossover youth research points to the necessity of a multi-system collaboration to comprehensively address the risks and needs of crossover youth. Such efforts require, at a minimum, the use of coordinated case assignment between child welfare and juvenile justice, joint assessment, coordinated case plans, and coordinated case supervision. Additionally, jurisdictions should integrate the use of best practice and evidence based programs as they relate to child welfare, juvenile justice, mental health, substance abuse, and education.⁷

A Robert F. Kennedy National Resource Center for Juvenile Justice whitepaper entitled *"From Conversation to Collaboration: How Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice Agencies Can Work Together to Improve Outcomes for Dual Status Youth"* provides information about how jurisdictions have transformed the culture and practices of their youth serving agencies with respect to meeting needs and addressing challenges of dual status youth – youth who have crossed over and are in contact with both child welfare and juvenile justice systems.⁸

The Robert F. Kennedy National Resource Center for Juvenile Justice suggests that jurisdictions begin to collaborate using the framework provided in the *"Guidebook for Juvenile Justice and Child Welfare System Integration and Coordination,"* and with the technical assistance approached outlined in *"Dual Status Youth – Technical Assistance Workbook."*⁹ The whitepaper states, "Beginning to collaborate, or enhancing existing collaborations, starts by bringing individuals together to educate one another about their roles, mandates, resources and expertise, and to collectively explore solutions to shared challenges. Collaboration simply begins with a conversation."¹⁰ Often the initial conversation happens between child welfare and probation agencies. Some common threads and beliefs have been revealed that fall into four categories which present challenging, but essential starting points for conversation between child welfare and juvenile justice – goals, roles, privacy, and capacity.¹¹

Diverting Delinquent Youth from Court

According to Vera Institute, research on youth with low-level delinquency offenses found that diverting delinquent youth from court and responding with community based programming is more effective in preventing future crime, and is more cost effective also.¹²

The Status Offense Reform Center developed “*A Toolkit for Status Offense System Reform*” which includes four modules that follow a sequence of steps common to many system reform processes.¹³ In module one judges are featured who use their statutory and inherent judicial powers to divert these youth from court involvement and incarceration. Many of the judges preside over jurisdictions that permit use of valid court order exception to the federal deinstitutionalization of status offenders’ requirement of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act.

Module three on planning and implementation stresses the importance of using the identified local need for change to drive the inquiry into the investigation of various reform approaches. In general, the reform or paradigm shift is to connect families with social services in their communities instead of turning to courts - handle status offenses outside the juvenile justice system.

In “*From Courts to Communities: The Right Response to Truancy, Running Away, and other Status Offenses*” (Vera Institute, 2013),¹⁴ the following are cited as hallmarks of an effective community-based response for young people charged with status offenses:

1. Diversion from court (mechanisms that actively steer families away from juvenile justice system).
2. An immediate response (professional to help de-escalate the response; cool-down period in which young person spends a few nights in a respite center).
3. Triage process – screen and assess, tailor services accordingly (at one end of the spectrum are families who require only brief intervention, at the other end are those who need intensive and ongoing support).
4. Services that are accessible and effective (easy access, engage the entire family, be proven to work).
5. Internal assessment (monitor outcomes and adjust practices as needed).

What works according to CJJR

- A parish in Louisiana operates a Resource Center that serves as central point of intake for families. Status offense cases petitioned to court have decreased to only one percent of referrals. Delay between seeking help and receiving help has dropped from 50 days to 2 hours.
- In another parish, Families in Need of Services uses MAYSI-2 coupled with interviews to match need with community services. This resulted in a 50 percent decrease in Families in Need of Services cases handled in court.
- In Clark County Washington, the Truancy Project includes a mix of support and supervision, including home visits. It also uses MAYSI-2 to assess mental health needs.
- In Florida, 91 percent of status offenders who received services in the community remained crime-free.
- New York City Truancy Task Force found use of “Success Mentors” was most effective with chronically truant. The NYC Success Mentor Corps paired at-risk students with school staff, retirees, social work students, AmeriCorps volunteers, and/or high school seniors. Students who had been chronically absent gained almost two additional weeks in school per year once they had a mentor. The attendance of some students with mentors rose by an entire month.

In another paper published by The Vera Institute about innovations in New York City health and child welfare policy, several responses that contributed to the decline of the number of NYC children in foster care are cited. One of those was the expansion of prevention services including the implementation of Multisystemic Therapy, Functional Family Therapy and Multidimensional Treatment Foster Care.¹⁵

Truancy and School Absenteeism

A research brief on truancy by the Status Offense Reform Center states that in addition to anxiety and depression, many students skip school because of fear and concern for their safety. Findings also include that the greatest increase in truancy occurs between 5th, 6th, 8th, 9th grades – key points of transitioning. There is evidence that truancy interventions differentially affect youth based upon severity of truant behavior and age.¹⁶

A study of truancy in the District of Columbia found: 1) lowering middle school absenteeism maybe the most efficient and effective way to lowering high school truancy rates; and, 2) truancy interventions that are primarily family-based are more likely to be effective at earlier ages, while truancy interventions at older ages need to also involve broader social contexts.¹⁷

In Los Angeles County, California, schools are moving to less zero tolerance and more thoughtful case planning and strengths based case management. According to Deputy Director of LA County Department of Children and Family Services, LA County leaders and advocates are recognizing that punitive actions tend to alienate struggling students, and are looking at root causes of truancy – focusing on the solutions - versus issuing citations.¹⁸

The Center for Juvenile Justice Reform (CJJR), Georgetown University

The Center for Juvenile Justice Reform (CJJR) developed the Crossover Youth Practice Model that describes specific practices which need to be in place within a jurisdiction in order to reduce the number of youth who crossover between the child welfare and juvenile justice systems, the number of youth entering and reentering care, and the length of stay in out-of-home care. The practice model includes, but is not limited to the following practices:

1. Creation of a process for identifying crossover youth at the point of crossing over.
2. Ensure that workers are exchanging information in a timely manner.
3. Include families in all decision-making aspects of the case.
4. Ensure that foster care bias is not occurring at the point of detention or disposition.
5. Maximize the services utilized by each system to prevent crossover from occurring.

According to CJJR, there is no research related to the effectiveness of programs with crossover youth specifically. The practice model itself and the recommended practices within it are derived from the current research about what works best for youth.

CJJR suggests that based upon the profiles presented by crossover youth, there are several programs which should be considered. Wraparound, Multi-Dimensional Therapeutic Foster Care, Anger Replacement Therapy, and cognitive behavioral trauma programs represent a few programs that address the complex issues presented by crossover youth.

Implementing the Crossover Youth Practice Model King County, Washington - PathNet

One of the sites implementing the Crossover Youth Practice Model is Education and Work Solutions in King County, Washington. It formed PathNet, “a pathway of youth-serving organizations.” The cornerstones of PathNet are: 1) strengths-based assessment; 2) student-driven plan; 3) connect to right education/vocation program (to create stability); 4) a Care Manager – every student is paired with a significant adult.

The process can start with a teacher, school resource officer, probation officer, or child welfare worker – who leads youth to the Connections Coordinator. The Connections Coordinator conducts a strengths-based assessment, works with the student to provide the student-driven plan, links youth with applicable program staff, and ensures there is a Care Manager or significant adult committed to the youth.

Because high school graduation was unattainable for 70 percent of youth in King County detention, PathNet includes an alternative pathway of remedial courses and GED preparation, and vocational programming. Legislative action ensures funding through basic education apportionment with the FTE (full time enrollment) student count being held dependent upon progress – not seat time (*WA Substitute House Bill 1418*).¹⁹

The Robert F. Kennedy National Resource Center for Juvenile Justice cites King County as an example of how a multi-system conversation provided the starting point for a transformative process. The work to create a collaborative model for system integration in King County began with a one-day symposium for leaders of youth-serving systems. Among the attendees were representatives from a wide range of agencies at both county and state levels. An executive steering committee was formed and met regularly to provide an ongoing opportunity to educate and explore new ideas as a multi-system team. With the support of expert facilitation, a dialogue between systems began, resulting in the drafting of a charter to guide a strategic planning process for systems integration. Within the initial dialogue, primary goals were jointly developed and a structure for oversight and leadership was established.²⁰

Role of Trauma

According to “*The Adolescent Brain: New Research and Its Implications for Young People Transitioning from Foster Care*” published by the Jim Casey Youth Opportunities Initiative, “The field of social welfare must make building social relationships and networks a priority in all services.

What works

- Law enforcement – Identify providers who are having high percentage of youth arrested (group homes) and involve law enforcement before problems arise (example: law enforcement plays sports with youth). Building positive relationships made the ability to de-escalate more effective.
- Placement providers – Need to understand trauma and history of youth so they are better able to deal with challenges. Provide trauma-informed training for staff, including helping staff to understand their own perceptions about youth.
- Schools – School Resource Officers develop mentor/advisor type relationship with youth.
- A multi-disciplinary meeting (family centered team, joint assessment - several different names) to share information, identify needs of youth, and link youth and family with needed resources (come up with most appropriate outcome for youth).

Positive youth development services, opportunities, and supports are essential in counteracting the effects of trauma. There is a critical need for effective trauma-informed and trauma-specific practices in addressing the identity and grief related issues that older youth and young adults in foster care are likely to experience. The concepts of resiliency and neuroplasticity provide a foundation for developing trauma-informed child welfare practice and trauma-specific mental health services and supports for young people in foster care.”²¹

Recommendations are to:

- Take a positive youth development approach to all opportunities for youth in foster care.
- Provide “interdependent” living services that connect young people with family and caring adults.
- Engage young people in their own planning and decision-making.
- Be trauma-informed to promote healing and emotional security.

A study published by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention entitled “*Children’s Exposure to Violence and Intersection Between Delinquency and Victimization*,” suggests beginning intervention early with children who have been victimized and exhibit mental health symptoms. The study’s authors suggest that efforts begin around or before 5th grade, and include components that minimize sexual aggression and harassment.”²²

Family Instability

Policies that help poor and low-income families can lead to improvements in outcomes for children in those families. According to research published in 2013 by the Urban Institute entitled “*The Negative Effects of Instability on Child Development*,” children’s early experiences shape who they are and affect their lifelong health and learning. Children thrive in stable and nurturing environments where they have routine and know what to expect. Instability and the family stress that comes with it, can have deep and lasting impacts on children’s physical, emotional and cognitive development. The paper cites five types of instability: economic, employment, family, residential, and out-of-home settings.

Parental employment instability has been linked to poor academic outcomes, and poor social emotional outcomes for young children. Children whose mothers experience employment instability exhibit more problem behaviors, such as bullying or being withdrawn, and are more likely to be absent from school.

Family transitions that occur prior to age six and in adolescence appear to have strongest effects. For infants, changes in child care can lead to poor attachment with providers and problem behaviors. Adolescents experiencing multiple moves show difficulty adapting, express negative social behaviors, and have a greater chance of dropping out of school. School mobility has the strongest effect during early elementary and high school, with multiple school transfers leading to worse effects.²³

Parents’ substance abuse is another factor that contributes to family instability, and children being removed from their homes. According to research cited within *Show Me the Money*:

Child Welfare Cost Savings of a Family Drug Court, “Between 25 percent and 80 percent of child welfare cases involve alcohol and other drugs indicated on the child welfare petition. In the best interests of the child, child welfare and the substance abuse treatment community must work together to address the challenging needs of parents involved in child welfare who have substance abuse issues.”²⁴

Family Instability: Implication for Policy and Practice

The Urban Institute states, “programs might be able to do more to stabilize situations for children by considering how policies or administrative practices inadvertently increase instability. The more hoops there are, the less likely families experiencing instability will be able to handle applying for and maintaining safety net programs. Simplified reporting procedures, longer eligibility periods and single centralized eligibility process for multiple programs would be a start to helping families in need stay covered. Having systems and policies in place in early childhood programs and schools to identify families who are experiencing multiple changes is one strategy for targeting extra services and case management.”²⁵

Policy Recommendations

In January 2014, the Texas Public Policy Foundation made recommendations in testimony to the Kansas House Corrections and Juvenile Justice Committee, although their recommendations were not adopted. The following recommendations are in-line with the Crossover Youth Practice Model developed by the Center for Juvenile Justice Reform, and the Models for Change Initiative established by the MacArthur Foundation.

Recommendations made by The Texas Public Policy Foundation,²⁶ included the following:

1. Limit incarceration of status offenders. Modify juvenile laws so that only in cases in which status offenders have a prior non-status offense, and can be shown through validated risk assessment to pose a high-risk to public safety, should be they considered for appropriate placement in secure detention.
2. Promote police diversion. In Texas police can divert a case before it reaches court through a warning or by “disposition without referral to court.” The referral may involve referral to an agency that provides services such as crisis family intervention, family counseling, parenting skills training, youth coping skills training, and mentoring.
3. Require schools to adopt a tiered disciplinary model proven to improve student behavior and reduce unnecessary removals and court referrals. Sedgwick County developed written agreement between police and schools to reduce school-based arrests for low-level offenses. Texas, Alabama, Georgia have tiered models.
4. Seek federal Title IV-E Waiver to gain more flexibility in child welfare funding in coordination with juvenile justice system. The waiver would allow funding to be received based upon factors other than when a child is removed from home. Funding then can be used for prevention and family preservation. Waivers have enabled implementation of an array of

services to prevent foster care placements and facilitate permanency for children in foster care. According to analysis by Washington State Institute for Public Policy, these programs produced benefits: Intensive Family Preservation Service Programs (Homebuilders® model), Parent-Child Interaction Therapy, Dependency (or Family Treatment) Drug Courts.

5. Give victims the option of victim-offender mediation in appropriate cases. Allow victims of certain offenses (low-level property offenses and criminal mischief) to choose mediation over traditional court process.

Next Steps for Consideration

1. Develop collective responsibility across systems for crossover children and youth. Make strategic decisions about multi-system collaboration, as well as the investment and sustainability of resources that address the crossover population.
2. Learn more about crossover youth in Johnson County and determine where crossover is occurring.
 - To prevent crossover, must know where crossover is actually happening; this provides indicators into where to start the work. Is it occurring 1) in a placement center, 2) at school, 3) encounter with law enforcement, or 4) unknown?
 - Who are these youth in Johnson County? Look at a sample of crossover youth (approximately 25). What are their characteristics? Identify the common traits. Is this their first referral to system, what is current placement type, how many placement moves have they had?
3. Once know where youth are crossing over and some characteristics, think about who needs to start working on prevention efforts. Most communities start with child welfare, juvenile justice and family court; however, other partners such as law enforcement, placement providers, mental health, and schools should be included at some point. Further, it is important to bring in perspective of young people, families, and line workers – not just the director/manager.
4. Provide data to school districts about crossover youth; these are the youth who may be causing disruption in schools. Because crossover youth represent a small number of students, engaging the education system has been challenging for communities. Establish a MOU so people can share information; quickly identify youth in the system. For example, identify a liaison/ point person at each school who understands child welfare and juvenile justice systems and can serve as person who gets list of young people involved in these systems (list not floated around), and who can work to understand who these youth are and how to best provide services.
5. The Center for Juvenile Justice Reform at Georgetown offers a certification program on multi-system integration. Consider if interest/feasible for team from Johnson County to pursue this and which system would lead the effort. Team might include Court Services, Corrections, Kansas Department for Children and Families (DCF), Office of D.A., Criminal Justice Coordinator, judge(s). This is a weeklong program of intensive study designed for

those who want to improve outcomes for crossover youth by improving multi-systems integration and collaboration. The certificate program focuses on policies, programs and practices related to crossover youth. Tuition cost is \$4,500 per individual (may apply for tuition subsidy).

6. Actively engage all Johnson County public school districts in training and support for trauma-informed practices and policies; connect to Johnson County Trauma Informed Care Task Force.
7. Consider strategies to safely and effectively divert status offenders from formal juvenile justice system. (See page 5 and information from Status Offense Reform Center, Vera Institute.)
8. Target prevention at highly victimized youth with mental health symptoms.
9. Address parents' substance abuse; involve substance abuse treatment providers.
10. Pay attention to the state's involvement in national efforts and consider advocating for the state to apply for Title IV-E waiver.²⁷
11. Consider endorsing some of the policy recommendations made by Texas Public Policy Foundation to the Kansas House Corrections and Juvenile Justice Committee.

Appendix A

Suggested Reading/Resources

The Center for Juvenile Justice Reform (CJJR), Georgetown University:

Crossover Youth Practice Model <http://cjjr.georgetown.edu/pm/practicemodel.html>.

Webinar series “Improving Outcomes for Multi-System Involved Youth Who Cross Over Between Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice Systems:”

September 26, 2012, “Preventing Youth from Crossing Over Between Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice,” and January 29, 2013, “Crossover Youth Practice Model: Results from First Year of Implementation.”

John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation’s Models for Change: Systems Reform in Juvenile Justice www.modelsforchange.net.

The Models for Change Resource Center Partnership is anchored by four Resource Centers:

- 1) National Center for Mental Health and Criminal Justice www.cfc.ncmhjj.com.
- 2) National Juvenile Defender Center www.njdc.info/resourcecenterpartnership.php.
- 3) Status Offense Reform Center, Vera Institute of Justice www.statusoffensereform.org.
- 4) Robert F. Kennedy National Resource Center for Juvenile Justice: www.rfknrcjj.org.

Numerous publication, including, but not limited to:

- *Truancy: A Research Brief*, Status Offense Reform Center, Vera Institute of Justice, Dec. 2013.
- *From Courts to Communities: The Right Response to Truancy, Running Away, and other Status Offenses*, Status Offense Reform Center, Vera Institute of Justice, December, 2013.
- *Guidebook for Juvenile Justice and Child Welfare System Coordination and Integration: A Framework for Improved Outcomes*. Models for Change, Systems Reform in Juvenile Justice, Robert F. Kennedy Children’s Action Corps, Third Addition, December 2013.
- *From Conversation to Collaboration: How Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice Agencies Can Work Together to Improve Outcomes for Dual Status Youth*, Robert F. Kennedy National Resource Center for Juvenile Justice, 2014.
- *Underage Drinking: A Research Brief*, Status Offense Reform Center, December 2013.
- *Innovations in NYC Health and Human Services Policy*, Vera Institute of Justice, January 2014.

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention www.ojp.usdoj.gov.

Children’s Exposure to Violence and Intersection Between Delinquency and Victimization, October 2013.

Girls Study Group – Charting Way to Delinquency Prevention for Girls, 2008.

Jim Casey Youth Opportunities Initiative - *The Adolescent Brain: New Research and Its Implications for Young People Transitioning from Foster Care*, 2011.

Child Welfare League of America - *Understanding Child Maltreatment and Juvenile Delinquency*, 2003.

Urban Institute - *Child Welfare: The Challenges of Collaboration*, 2009.

At-Risk and Delinquent Girls Programs in the SafeFutures Demonstration, 2006 –Justice Policy Center.

The Negative Effects of Instability on Child Development, 2013.

National Clearinghouse on Child Abuse and Neglect Information, <http://nccanch.acf.hhs.gov>.

Substance Abuse and Child Maltreatment, December 2003.

National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges

Show Me the Money: Child Welfare Cost Savings of a Family Drug Court, Journal 62, no. 3, 2011.

Appendix B

Program Searches on Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development and Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, National Registry of Evidence Based Programs and Practices:

Annie E. Casey Foundation, Univ. of Colorado, Boulder – Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development: *Search criteria: Delinquency (Preschool through High School)*

Functional Family Therapy
Life Skills Training
Multidimensional Treatment Foster Care
Multisystemic Therapy
Positive Action
Behavioral Monitoring and Reinforcement Program
Communities That Care
Coping Power
EFFEKT (formerly the Orebro Prevention Program)
Guiding Good Choices
High Scope Preschool
Olweus Bullying Prevention

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, National Registry of Evidence Based Programs and Practices: *Search criteria – Foster Care*

Multidimensional Treatment Foster Care (MTFC)
Child and Family Traumatic Stress Intervention
Cognitive Behavioral Intervention for Trauma in Schools (CBITS)
HOMEBUILDERS – intensive family preservation services
Multisystemic Therapy for youth with Problem Sexual Behaviors (MST-PSB)
Multisystemic Therapy with Psychiatric Supports (MST-Psychiatric)
ParentCorps (family prevention intervention, young children in low income families)
Real Life Heroes (based upon Cognitive Behavior Therapy for treating PTSD in school-aged youth)
Residential Student Assistant Program (RSAP) – designed to prevent and reduce alcohol/drug use in high risk youth (12-18) who are in residential child facility
Trauma-Focused Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (TF-CBT)

Appendix C

Recommended Practices and Products for Handling Dual Status Youth

Content below is from *Guidebook for Juvenile Justice and Child Welfare System Coordination and Integration: A Framework for Improved Outcomes, third edition*. Models for Change, Systems Reform in Juvenile Justice. Property of Robert F. Kennedy Children's Action Corps.²⁸

In the work conducted with jurisdictions in systems coordination and integration over the past 10 years, a set of practices and products have emerged from the various jurisdictions experiences. The following is a listing of the practices and products that are recommended to new jurisdictions taking on this work, believed to be critical to improved handling of dual status youth. These practices and products can be incorporated in the action strategies that jurisdictions develop at this phase of their planning process.

Practices

- Development of individual outcomes for each youth focused on competencies and connections to family and community.
- Routine identification of dual status youth within a prescribed time frame.
- Use of validated screening and assessment instruments.
- Development and use of a joint assessment process or methodology across systems and in collaboration with the youth and family.
- Identification and development of opportunities for alternatives to formal processing at key decision points.
- Use of a structured process for the consideration of diversion, early intervention, and alternatives to formal processing at the earliest possible opportunity.
- Development of procedures for routine, ongoing contact between probation officers and child welfare workers over the life of each dual status case.
- Employment of coordinated case planning, coordinated court processes, and coordinated case management.
- Focus on family stability, placement stability, and community connections.
- Engagement of families in decision making processes that impact their children, as well as in policy and program development decisions that impact cross system handing of all dual status youth.

Products

- MOU detailing the various agencies' commitments to cross system collaboration and coordination.
- Information sharing agreement.
- Data sharing agreement.
- List of desired system and youth and family outcomes.
- Case flow process map and narrative.
- Policy and protocol documentation.
- Assessment and resources inventories.
- System for data collection and management to measure the achievement of outcomes.
- Multi-system training plan.
- Implementation Manual.

Appendix D



The following is a listing of all the practice elements that are recommended in the Crossover Youth Practice Model. The larger practice model document provides the supporting research and explanation of the recommended practices. This list is exhaustive and recommended to be used with the larger Crossover Youth Practice Model. Please note that the implementation of these practices is based on an assessment of each individual jurisdiction and will reflect that systems construct.

Phase I/Practice Area I:

- Creation of protocols that specify how client information databases can be searched to identify crossover youth at the point crossover occurs.
- Creation of a memorandum of agreement that describes the ability of child welfare and juvenile justice staff to share information about youth and families involved in both systems. These agreements may also include sharing of educational and behavioral health information.
- Ensuring the use of validated screening and cross system assessment tools currently utilized while the youth is in detention.

Phase I/Practice Area II:

- Conducting diversion meetings currently and implementing strategies to reduce youth crossing over into the juvenile justice system.
- Ensuring the Courts, CW, and JJ systems partner on identifying and funding prevention services to ensure that crossover youth have access to services funded by both systems.
- Ensure that CW social workers attend all JJ court hearings for assigned crossover cases (and vice versa).

Phase II/Practice Area III:

- Upon notification of a new crossover youth case, the newly assigned JJ caseworker is required to make contact with the CW social worker within a specified amount of time (3-5 days).
- Complete an inventory of the assessment tools used in both the child welfare and juvenile justice agencies.
- Creation of a crossover youth joint assessment process that includes review of the following information:
 - a. Review of behavior patterns over time;
 - b. Examination of the family strengths and protective factors;
 - c. Assessment of the overall needs of the youth and family that affect the safety, permanency, and well-being of children and youth in the family;
 - d. Consideration of contributing factors (caregivers) such as domestic violence, substance abuse, mental health, chronic health problems, and poverty;

- e. Assessment of criminogenic factors including peer group, school performance, family dynamics, substance abuse, self-regulation, history of delinquent behaviors; and
- f. Review of information gathered through other assessments from partnering agencies (i.e. mental health, substance abuse).
- Creation of an integrated case plan (or planning process) between JJ and CW that:
 - a. Creates a direct link between the identified need areas and the goals, tasks, interventions and services.
 - b. Focuses interventions on assisting parents/caregivers to improve their parenting skills and the youth in changing his/her risk taking behaviors.
 - c. Are focused, time limited, behaviorally specific, attainable, relevant, and understandable to all and agreed to by the parent(s).
 - d. Provide the basis for understanding when the work is completed. Conversely, they provide the basis for deciding that sufficient change has not occurred so that permanency goals may be justified and pursued.
- Engaging families to help guide the process of determining what interventions could best address their situation, within the context of a shared commitment to making necessary changes.
- Conducting an assessment of the level of frequency that crossover youth are placed in group care settings (including residential and institutional). When such a placement occurs ensuring that it is time-limited with an effectuated plan for exit.
- Timely identification of kin that are willing to serve as placement resource or aid the youth in other capacities (this includes re-assessing kin that were previously ruled out).
- Implementation of any one of the following Court models:
 - a. Dedicated docket;
 - b. The One-family/one judge model or;
 - c. Pre-court coordination: which requires that the team of individuals serving the youth and their family come together prior to the court hearing and develop a single set of recommendations addressing the child welfare and juvenile justice issues.

Phase III/Practice Area IV:

- Ensuring that CW social workers and JJ caseworkers make a determination as to which agency should take the lead in providing services in the case of a youth that has crossed over.
- Having required levels of contact that must be maintained between the CW social worker and JJ caseworker regarding each case (i.e. bi-weekly communication).
- Permitting the conducting of formal meetings to be held on crossover cases at the following times in the life of a case (or as deemed necessary by the assigned workers):
 - a. Prior to court hearings;
 - b. When there is a significant change in family dynamics;
 - c. When there is a change in youth status (i.e. change in school performance, increased socialization with peers involved in illegal behaviors, use of substance, or positive changes etc.);
 - d. Whenever a family member requests a meeting.

Phase III/ Practice Area V:

- Begin permanency planning at the onset of the crossover case.
- Engaging in concurrent planning for all crossover youth.
- Ensuring that crossover youth exiting care are afforded education, support and skill development so that they are as prepared as possible to transition successfully to adulthood.
- Engage in the utilization of Permanency Pacts for crossover youth preparing to age out of care.

Copied with permission by Center for Juvenile Justice Reform, Georgetown University

Endnotes

¹ The Center for Juvenile Justice Reform (CJJR), Georgetown University: *Crossover Youth Practice Model*. Retrieved from <http://cjjr.georgetown.edu>.

² Ibid.

³ Cathy Wisdom and Michael Maxfield. *An Update on the "Cycle of Violence," Research in Brief*. March 2001. Retrieved from National Institute of Justice. www.nij.gov.

⁴ The Center for Juvenile Justice Reform (CJJR), Georgetown University: *Crossover Youth Practice Model*. Retrieved from <http://cjjr.georgetown.edu>

⁵ Caterina Gouvis Roman, Rebecca Naser, Shelli B. Rossman, Jennifer L. Castro, Jennifer M. Lynn-Whaley. *At-Risk and Delinquent Girls Programs in the Safe Futures Demonstration*. November, 2006. Retrieved from www.urban.org.

⁶ The Center for Juvenile Justice Reform (CJJR), Georgetown University: Crossover Youth Practice Model Webinar Series, *"Improving Outcomes for Multi-System Involved Youth Who Cross Over Between Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice Systems,"* 2012.

⁷ The Center for Juvenile Justice Reform (CJJR), Georgetown University: *Crossover Youth Practice Model*. Retrieved from <http://cjjr.georgetown.edu>.

⁸ Robert F. Kennedy National Resource Center for Juvenile Justice. *From Conversation to Collaboration: How Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice Agencies Can Work Together to Improve Outcome for Dual Status Youth*. 2014. Retrieved from www.rfknrcjj.org.

⁹ Robert F. Kennedy National Resource Center for Juvenile Justice. Retrieved from www.rfknrcjj.org.

¹⁰ Robert F. Kennedy National Resource Center for Juvenile Justice. *From Conversation to Collaboration: How Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice Agencies Can Work Together to Improve Outcome for Dual Status Youth*. 2014. Retrieved from www.rfknrcjj.org.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Annie Salsich and Jennifer Trone. *From Courts to Communities: The Right Response to Truancy, Running Away, and other Status Offenses*. Status Offense Reform Center, Vera Institute of Justice. December 2013 Retrieved from www.statusoffensereform.org.

¹³ Retrieved from www.statusoffensereform.org.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Allon Yaroni, PhD, Ryan Shanahan, PhD, Randi Rosenblum, PhD, Timothy Ross, PhD, *Innovation in NYC Health and Human Services Policy*. Status Offense Reform Center, Vera Institute of Justice. January 2014. Retrieved from Status Offense Reform Center www.statusoffensereform.org.

¹⁶ Sydney McKinney, *Truancy: A Research Brief*. Status Offense Reform Center, Vera Institute of Justice, Dec. 2013. Retrieved from Status Offense Reform Center www.statusoffensereform.org.

-
- ¹⁷ Akiva Liberman and Meagan Cahill, *Variation in 2010-11 Truancy Rates Among District of Columbia Public Schools – High Schools and Middle Schools*. District of Columbia Crime, Policy Institute, Urban Institute, Nov. 2012. Retrieved from www.urban.org.
- ¹⁸ The Center for Juvenile Justice Reform (CJJR), Georgetown University: Crossover Youth Practice Model Webinar Series, “*Improving Outcomes for Multi-System Involved Youth Who Cross Over Between Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice Systems*.” September 26, 2012.
- ¹⁹ Ibid.
- ²⁰ Robert F. Kennedy National Resource Center for Juvenile Justice. *From Conversation to Collaboration: How Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice Agencies Can Work Together to Improve Outcome for Dual Status Youth*. 2014. Retrieved from www.rfknrcjj.org.
- ²¹ *The Adolescent Brain: New Research and Its Implications for Young People Transitioning from Foster Care, Executive Summary*. Jim Casey Youth Opportunities Initiative. 2011. Retrieved from www.jimcaseyouth.org.
- ²² Carolos A. Cuevas, David Finkelhor, Anne Shattuck, Heather Turner and Sherry Hamby, *Children’s Exposure to Violence and the Intersection Between Delinquency and Victimization*. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. 2013. www.ojjdp.gov/pubs/240555.pdf.
- ²³ Heather Sandstrom and Sandra Huerta, *The Negative Effects of Instability on Child Development*. Urban Institute. Low-Income Working Families Fact Sheet. September, 2013. Retrieved from www.urban.org.
- ²⁴ Scott W.M. Burrus, Juliette R. Mackin, and Michael W. Finigan. *Show Me the Money: Child Welfare Cost Savings of a Family Drug Court*. Juvenile and Family Court, Journal 62, no. 3 (Summer). National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, 2011. Citing research from: Besharov, 1989; Child Welfare Information Gateway, 2003; Magura and Laudet, 1996; Murphy et al., 1991; National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse, 1999; Young, Gardner, Whitaker, Yeh and Otero, 2005; Child Welfare League of America, 2001; Semedei, Radel and Nolan, 2001.
- ²⁵ Heather Sandstrom and Sandra Huerta, *The Negative Effects of Instability on Child Development*. Urban Institute. Low-Income Working Families Fact Sheet. September, 2013. Retrieved from www.urban.org.
- ²⁶ Testimony of Marc A. Levin, Director of the Center for Effective Justice at the Texas Public Policy Foundation and Policy Director of the Right on Crime Initiative, before the Kansas House Corrections and Juvenile Justice Committee, January 21, 2014. All recommendations are not included in the literature review.
- ²⁷ In 2013, the State of Kansas was one of seven states selected by the National Governors Association (NGA) to participate in the Three Branch Institute on Child Social and Emotional Well-Being. The goal of the institute is to develop state-specific plans to promote and measure well-being among children and youth receiving child welfare services; consider evidence based and research informed practices that will have a positive effect; and coordinate and enhance existing efforts through cross-system collaboration (leverage work of executive, judicial and legislative branches), and by leveraging Medicaid and other federal and state dollars to fund innovative practices. NGA’s report will include “lessons learned;” some of the states participating in NGA’ Three Branch Institute have obtained the Federal Title IV-E Waiver.
- ²⁸ Janet K. Wiig and John A. Tuell, with Jessica K. Heldman, *Guidebook for Juvenile Justice and Child Welfare System Coordination and Integration: A framework for Improved Outcomes*, 3rd edition. Models for Change Systems Reform in Juvenile Justice, Robert F. Kennedy Children’s Action Corps, 2013. Retrieved from www.rfknrcjj.org.