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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.

**Our Programs:**
- Crossover Youth Practice Model
- Youth in Custody Practice Model
- Center for Coordinated Assistance to States
- Certificate Programs
- Juvenile Justice Leadership Network
- Juvenile Justice System Improvement Project
- Public Information Officers Learning Collaborative

For more information go to http://cjjr.georgetown.edu
Today’s Presentation

- Brief Overview of the Pathways and Characteristics of youth that crossover between systems
- Overview of the CYPM Goals
- Research Supporting the CYPM and its Effectiveness
- Impact of CYPM on Agency Culture
## DEFINING YOUTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terminology</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crossover youth</td>
<td>Youth who experience maltreatment and engage in delinquent acts---these youth may or may not have an investigation and/or involvement in one or both systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual system</td>
<td>Crossover youth who are referred for an investigation and/or have involvement with both the child welfare and juvenile justice systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual contact</td>
<td>Dual systems youth who are referred for an investigation and/or have involvement with both the child and the juvenile justice but the referral/involvement across systems is non-concurrent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dually involved</td>
<td>Dual systems youth who are referred for an investigation and/or have involvement with both the child welfare and juvenile justice systems concurrently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dually adjudicated</td>
<td>Dual systems youth who are formally adjudicated in both the child welfare and juvenile justice system concurrently</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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
- Persistent 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
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
## System Challenges to Improve Outcomes for Youth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Sharing</th>
<th>Integrated Data Systems</th>
<th>Identification of Youth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Interpretation of the laws</td>
<td>• Bifurcated systems (i.e., child welfare, State agency; juvenile justice, county agency; multiple school districts)</td>
<td>• No collaboration if we do not know whom the youth is connected to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Err on the side of “caution”</td>
<td>• Costly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Misunderstanding of systems function</td>
<td>• Concerns about data misuse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reductions In:

- Number of youth crossing over and becoming dually-involved
- Number of youth placed in out of home care
- Use of Congregate Care
- Disproportionate representation of youth of color
## CYPM Implementation Seeks to Achieve

### Reductions In:
- Juvenile Justice System Penetration
- Use of Pre-Adjudication Detention
- Use of APPLA as a Permanency Goal
- Education Instability
- Rate of Recidivism
- Re-Entering CW from JJ

### Increases In:
- Information Sharing
- Family Voice in Decision Making
- Youth/Parent Satisfaction & Engagement
- Coordinated Assessment, Case Planning, and Management
- Pro-Social Bonds
- Use of Diversion
- Reunification and Placements at Home
Outline the systemic processes (in phases) that are enhanced or developed to support youth that travel between child welfare and juvenile justice.

**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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overarching Outcomes Achieved to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reductions In:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recidivism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use of APPLA as a Permanency Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New Sustained JJ Petitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use of Pre-Adjudication Detention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increases In:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Educational Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pro-Social Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Positive Behavioral Health Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Diversion/Dismissal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Home Placement/Reunification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Social Supports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
  - Evaluated CYPM efforts in a Minnesota county
  - Finding: “Youth receiving CYPM services were less likely to recidivate than propensity score matched youth receiving ‘services as usual’ even when controlling for location, time and other key covariates.”

Haight, et al. also conducted a study on the experiences of professionals in five Minnesota CYPM sites
  - Finding: 99% of CYPM participants reported positive, structural changes in service delivery
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
Douglas County’s CYPM ("Youth Impact!") Cost-Benefit Analysis

- Estimated annual savings of ~$170,000/year
In 2018, CALIFORNIA EVIDENCED BASED CLEARINGHOUSE

Designated the CYPM as having “Promising Research Evidence” with a rating of 3 and a relevance of “High” in the “Child/Family Well-Being” outcome category.
Provisions of Training & Technical Assistance

- Site-Based TTA to support implementation of the Model
  - Up to three counties per cohort (*number determined based on size of the jurisdictions*)
- 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 (*various options of support for data*)
- Assistance with state-level policy development
- Quality Assurance to assess model fidelity (post-implementation)
  - Focus groups etc. can be convened pre-implementation to inform model development
CYPM JURISDICTIONS

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

California
- Alameda Co.
- Los Angeles Co.
- Sacramento Co.
- San Diego Co.

Colorado
- Alamosa Co.
- Broomfield Co.
- Conejos Co.
- Costilla Co.
- Denver Co.
- Douglas Co.
- Gunnison Co.
- Jefferson Co.
- Larimer Co.
- Mesa Co.
- Mineral Co.
- Morgan Co.
- Rio Grande Co.
- Saguache Co.

Connecticut
- New London 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.

Massachusetts
- Cheshire Co.
- Essex Co.
- Hampden Co.
- Berkshire Co.
- Plymouth Co.

Minnesota
- Carver Co.
- Hennepin Co.
- Hennepin 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.

Nevada
- Washoe 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.
- 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.
- Georgetown Co.

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

Virginia
- Alexandria

Washington
- King Co.

Wyoming
- Laramie Co.
Publications

- Engaging Court Appointed Special Advocates to Improve Outcomes for Crossover Youth
- Improving Educational Outcomes for Crossover Youth
- CYPM: An Abbreviated Guide
- Research Supports Model’s Effectiveness in Improving Outcomes for Youth
- The Protective Potential of Prosocial Activities: A Review of the Literature and Recommendations for Child-Serving Agencies
For more information, log onto: https://cjjr.georgetown.edu

Contact: Macon Stewart at macon.stewart@georgetown.edu or 704-603-8059