



CROSSOVER YOUTH PRACTICE MODEL

CENTER FOR JUVENILE JUSTICE REFORM

working across systems of care georgetown university

Kansas State Policy Team Meeting
Topeka, Kansas
January 23, 2020

Welcome

- Secretaries Howard and Zmuda opened the meeting by describing the importance of the Crossover Youth Practice Model (CYPM) initiative and their support of the State Policy Team in its endeavor to implement the Model across Kansas.

National Research on Crossover Youth and CYPM Overview

- Members of Georgetown's Center for Juvenile Justice Reform (CJJR) reviewed the national research on crossover youth as it relates to youths' involvement with the juvenile justice, child welfare, and education systems as well as demographic and psychosocial characteristics common to the population. Prevalent trajectories and life outcomes of crossover youth were described with emphasis on both personal and systems impacts.
- CJJR also presented on the CYPM. The tenets of the Model were described from prevention, information sharing, and collaborative angles. Goals of the Model were discussed, as was a description of how the Model is implemented to achieve those goals. The presentation concluded with a summary of both internal and external evaluations of the Model's efficacy.
- Conversation topics arose from the presentation, including:
 - *Learning from 'isolated incidents' that occur in schools, residential facilities, homes, etc. to craft protocols that would enable ground level staff to appropriately address the needs of youth and their families without further pushing youth into either system.* The State Policy Team acknowledged a need to assess the challenges that arise in these instances in order to create a plan for how to address them.
 - *Capitalizing on SB367, such as the requirement for MDT meetings and shared case planning across agencies under the Immediate Intervention Programs statute.* This topic had been broached by the Juvenile Justice Oversight Committee two years ago, but due to changes in leadership and challenges surrounding confidentiality efforts were halted. The CYPM State Policy Team agreed that this would be a beneficial area to investigate and provide guidance on.
 - *Challenges faced by implementing the CYPM.* Members of the Team acknowledged the following as barriers that presently exist: a lack of available and appropriate services, as well as Medicaid reimbursements for those services; minimal number of personnel working on cases in rural counties; ambiguity surrounding expectations of what collaboration looks like (or will look like under the upcoming merger) across agencies; multiple and inconsistent definitions for the term "crossover youth"; and overwhelming numbers of CINC cases in certain counties.

- *Counties are challenged with managing cases in which a youth is placed in a county but is arrested in another. There is no formal mechanism of how these cases are to be managed.*
- *Opportunities.*
 - The Medicaid expansion that is underway may improve access to services, particularly those related to behavioral health.
 - The Team also raised using funds from Family First to allocate to prevention efforts.
 - Identifying a way to provide crisis response services to youth in the locale they are placed in as opposed to having to procure services from their home county.
 - Members would like to create a list of acronyms to be shared across agencies to ameliorate some communication challenges.
 - The Team would like to consider establishing a long-term partnership with an organization (e.g., a university) to track outcomes, such as graduation rates, for crossover youth and to evaluate the efficacy of the CYPM in Kansas.

Defining Crossover Youth

- CJJR reviewed definitions of crossover youth as put forth by OJJDP, as well as those created by states who have implemented the CYPM.
- The Team provided feedback on the state crossover definitions:
 - Concern was raised about the lack of the word “trauma” in the state definitions.
 - Members expressed appreciation for considering voluntary services as well as trepidation about doing so in Kansas as it may prove too overwhelming to consider at this time.
 - The team preferred definitions aimed at dually-involved youth with an eye towards prevention.
 - Some members advised that Kansas’ definition be developed in direct consideration of how it would be used in practice, and noted that the definition ought to be as clear and simple as possible.

Review & Discussion of Kansas Reports

- CJJR provided an overview of the definitions for crossover youth that have circulated various groups in Kansas. Reports released by these groups were reviewed with particular focus on demographics and intake, juvenile justice, and child welfare experiences of the population (which was narrowly defined within each report).
- CJJR proposed five different options for target populations specific to Kansas, including one aimed at prevention. The State Policy Team discussed each definition and decided on the following:
 - *Dual-involvement (concurrent):* A young person age 10 and older with any level of concurrent involvement with the child welfare and juvenile justice systems, inclusive of out-of-home placements, probation, Immediate Intervention Programs (IIPs), and voluntary/preventative services.

- The Team advised against specifying “DCF” and “DOC” in the definition as doing so would exclude certain programs. Thus, the phrase “child welfare and juvenile justice systems” was adopted to cover all avenues.
- The State Policy Team would also like to include a target population for prevention. **CJJR will share language used by other CYPM and certificate program sites** to help the Team craft a prevention definition. Language for this definition should be solidified in the next 30 days. Stacy volunteered to acquire additional prevention-focused representation from DCF to join the Team, as well.
- Once the definitions are finalized, the State Policy Team will provide the Juvenile Justice Oversight Committee and certain legislators with the information.

County-Based Work

- CJJR recommended the State Policy Team do much of the ground work around the prevention efforts rather than have pilot sites work with both the prevention and dually-involved populations. In other words, the pilot sites will begin the CYPM work with the dually-involved population and will later add the prevention target population under the guidance of the State Policy Team.
- Pilot counties will use the exact definition of dually-involved youth that the State Policy Team agreed on. They will not be at liberty to modify it.
- The Kansas Juvenile Justice Oversight Committee recommended Shawnee County and Montgomery County to serve as the pilot sites. These counties were identified based on Juvenile Offender (JO) and Child in Need of Care (CINC) intake data. Community Corrections Directors from both counties were contacted and expressed interest in the initiative. Others from the counties have not yet been contacted.
- There was some debate over whether to use counties or judicial districts for the pilot sites. It was decided that counties would be used due to the number and various operations of district offices within judicial districts.
- Possible next steps:
 - Convene a group conference call with leaders from the pilot counties to introduce the concept of the CYPM.
 - The leadership group should include public health in addition to the other youth serving systems.
 - Create a list of counties based on population, JO and CINC cases filed and contact the top few to gauge interest in participating in the CYPM.
 - Approach JKAB (advisory boards).
 - Consider inviting service providers to contribute.

Team Goal Setting

- CJJR suggested the State Policy Team consider the following goals based on the Crossover Working Group Final Report (2020) focused on four pillars Information Sharing, Data, Services, and Prevention:
 - Flush out information sharing capacities based on law, consent, and judicial order
 - Focus on and target prevention efforts
 - Mobilize data collection, analysis, and sharing (aggregate and local levels) efforts that may be accomplished by changes to the law(s)
 - Mobilize efforts to improve service quality and accessibility around the state

- Services effort will include therapeutic and placement
- Other goals discussed include:
 - Establish regulatory change that would codify case practice
 - Propose new state law that would reinforce best case practice
 - Creation of policy agreements between agency heads that would facilitate case practice
 - Refine rules and procedures in court
 - Improve support to youth/families of single-family households or children of incarcerated parents with a focus on prevention
 - **CJJR will look into existing material on this topic**
 - Create and implement a policy toolkit
 - **CJJR will share toolkits that are in progress or that exist**

Next Steps

- Solidify what “prevention” means related to crossover
- Decide who the pilot sites are and confirm them
- Confirm the goals for the State Policy Team
 - *If you have ideas for goals, email them to Macon (macon.stewart@georgetown.edu) or Alex (am4020@georgetown.edu) prior to the next meeting (Feb. 26th)!*
- **Meeting time and frequency**
 - State Policy Team meetings will occur the 4th Wednesday of every month from 10am-12pm CT beginning February 26th.
 - Location: Kansas Judicial Center located at 301 SW 10th Ave., Topeka, KS (room TBD)
 - Individuals traveling from a distance will have the option to join via phone/video conference with the exception of every other month, in which all State Policy Team members are expected to convene in person (March 25th, May 27th, July 22nd, etc.).
 - CJJR will participate by phone or video conference.
 - **CJJR will share a calendar invitation inclusive of a Zoom video/call line.**
- Chair: Brady Burdge, ADA
- Co-Chair: Megan Milner, DOC