Addressing the Multi-System Needs of Youth Involved in Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice Systems: Lessons from the Crossover Youth Practice Model

Friday, July 27, 2018
8:30 am-12 pm
Moderator: Denise Sulzbach, Deputy Director, The TA Network

Faculty:
• Judge Denise Cubbon, Administrative Judge, Juvenile Division Lucas Co. Ohio Court of Common Pleas
• Walter Jackson, Assistant Director, Child, Adult, and Family Services Prince George’s Co. Department of Social Services
• Macon Stewart, Deputy Director, Multi-System Operations, Georgetown University Center for Juvenile Justice Reform
• Cynthia Stolz, Court Administrator, Fifth Judicial District of Pennsylvania, Children Court Family Law Center
• Kwabena Tuffour, Metro Assistant Regional Director, Maryland Department of Juvenile Services
What state, tribe, territory or community are you representing?

When poll is active, respond at PollEv.com/institutes20297 📞 Text INSTITUTES20297 to 22333 once to join
What is your role within your System of Care?

When poll is active, respond at PollEv.com/institutes20297  📞 Text INSTITUTES20297 to 22333 once to join
Categories of Youth

- **Crossover Youth**: Maltreated youth who engage in criminal activity but do not touch both systems
- **Dual System Youth**: Youth who touch both the child welfare and juvenile justice systems
- **Dually-Involved Youth**: Youth who touch both systems during the same timeframe
- **Dually Adjudicated Youth**: Youth who touch both systems during the same timeframe

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
Are you aware of any efforts in your jurisdiction that address this population?

Yes

No
Who Are the Youth Who Cross Over Into Delinquency?

**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 number of placements
- Absence of positive attachments
Characteristics of Crossover Youth

**Individual Characteristics**
- Truancy, dropout, and pushed out.
- Special education issues 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 half charged with violent offenses.
- One-quarter to one-half detained at the time of arrest.
- Prior contact with the system for previous delinquent, criminal, or status offense charges.
Characteristics: Mental Health and Substance Abuse Issues

MH = Mental health
SA = Substance abuse

Characteristics: Education Challenges

Youth involved with child welfare: higher risk
- Lower grade point average
- Missing school
- Repeating grades
- Experiencing behavior problems
- Involved in special education programs

(Romano, Babchishin, Marquis, & Frechette, 2014; Stone, 2007)

Youth involved with juvenile justice: higher risk
- Reduced educational attainment compared with their nondelinquent peers
- Youth who have been incarcerated exhibit both “substantially lower high school completion rates and higher adult incarceration rates”

(Aizer & Doyle, 2015; Tanner, Davies & O’Grady, 1999)

Crossover youth likely experience educational difficulties, need educational services, drop out of school, and have mental or behavioral health issues that impact school performance

(Gonsoulin & Read, 2011; Leone & Weinberg, 2012).
Group Discussion:

What are some of the challenges these youth face in your jurisdictions?
Experiences in the Juvenile Justice System

- **Preadjudication**: Inconsistent identification; more likely to be detained.
- **Charging**: System personnel perceive dually involved youth as higher risk; less likely to receive diversion.
- **Disposition**: Less likely to receive probation supervision and more likely to receive placement in a group home setting.

→ → Higher proportion of crossover youth → → →

Characteristics: Preadjudication Detention

Crossover youth are more likely to be detained preadjudication. Two hypotheses for this:

1. Lack of communication means that juvenile justice does not know where to release the youth.
2. Placement providers refuse to allow the youth home preadjudication.

Characteristics: Juvenile Justice Processing

Dispositions by Child Welfare Status

- Probation: 58% (DCFS), 73% (Non-DCFS)
- Suitable Placement: 21% (DCFS), 11% (Non-DCFS)
- Correctional Placement: 21% (DCFS), 16% (Non-DCFS)

Table Top Discussion:

1. What are the “actions” within your system that increase a youth’s risk of crossing over?
2. What are the systemic barriers that impact multi-system youth?
CYPM Phases

- **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>Arizona</th>
<th>Colorado</th>
<th>Kansas</th>
<th>Nebraska</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apache Co.</td>
<td>Alamosa Co.</td>
<td>Sedgwick Co.</td>
<td>Dodge Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coconino Co.</td>
<td>Conejos Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gage Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gila Co.</td>
<td>Costilla Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lancaster Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham Co.</td>
<td>Denver Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sarpy Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenlee Co.</td>
<td>Douglas Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Paz Co.</td>
<td>Jefferson Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maricopa Co.</td>
<td>Larimer Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohave Co.</td>
<td>Mesa Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navaho Co.</td>
<td>Mineral Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pima Co.</td>
<td>Morgan Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz. Co.</td>
<td>Saguache Co</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yavapai Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuma Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Co</td>
<td>Broomfield Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento Co.</td>
<td>Conejos Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Co.</td>
<td>Costilla Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Denver Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Jefferson Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brevard Co.</td>
<td>Larimer Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broward Co.</td>
<td>Mesa Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duval Co.</td>
<td>Mineral Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami-Dade Co.</td>
<td>Morgan Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion Co.</td>
<td>Rio Grande Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polk Co.</td>
<td>Saguache Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminole Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volusia Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Woodbury Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Sedgwick Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Carroll Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Harford Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Howard Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Co.</td>
<td>Montgomery Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cass Co.</td>
<td>Prince George’s Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greene Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnstown Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahoning Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stark Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trumbull Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>King Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>Laramie Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Douglas Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multnomah Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Allegheny Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia Co.</td>
<td>发射</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Berkley Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Bexar Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLennan Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perspective from the Field: Allegheny County, PA
Cynthia Stolz
Perspective from the Field: Prince George’s County, MD

Walter Jackson & Kwabena Tuffour
Prince George’s County’s Definition Of Crossover Youth

• Any youth in the care and custody of the Prince George’s County Department of Social Services (DSS) that is subsequently arrested

• Any youth currently under the supervision of the Maryland Department of Juvenile Services (DJS) that becomes the subject of a petition for neglect and/or abuse
Collaborative Case Planning among Prince George’s County DSS & DJS

- Case management is handled jointly by DSS and DJS from the point of arrest through the life of the case.
- DJS/DSS case managers/case workers are jointly assessing, developing services plans and providing supervision.
- DJS Case Managers attend all Child Welfare Family Involvement Meetings (FIM) and DSS case workers attend DJS Resource Staffing.
Case Identification among Prince George’s County DSS & DJS

- DJS submits arrest referral list to DSS daily by 10 AM
- DSS confirms the youth’s involvement with DSS
- Confirmed youth are submitted back to DJS within 2 business days
- Within 14 days, DJS sends a intake appointment notice to the DSS case worker and supervisor via email
- DSS notifies all relevant parties of the youth’s arrest and scheduled intake
Collaborative Intake Hearing between Prince George’s County DSS & DJS

The following information is shared at the DJS Intake hearing:

1. Consent Forms
2. DJS police report
3. DJS Maryland Comprehensive Assessment and Service Plan (MCASP)
4. DSS Service Plans, Maryland Family Risk Assessment, CANS assessment
5. DSS Permanency plan and current status of the child welfare case

Intake decision: warning, informal supervision, or court involvement
Joint Assessment & Planning between Prince George’s County DSS & DJS

• All crossover youth cases are referred to the Case Consultation Team (CCT) within 24 hours of adjudication

• The CCT convenes within 7 business days of a case referral

• CCT members include DJS, DSS, Mental Health Agency, Public Schools, & Housing Authority

• CCT attendees include the Youth, Family Members, Foster Parents, Attorney’s, and all relevant parties

• A recommendation is formalized for the Disposition Hearing
Educating Foster Parents about Crossover Youth

- Foster Parents are introduced to the CYPM during PRIDE training, which is a 27 hour training program covering 9 sessions.

- DSS conducts PRIDE training for prospective foster parents approximately every three months.

- The 3rd session introduces participants to the CYPM, describing the partnership between the DSS and DJS.
PRINCE GEORGE’S COUNTY – INITIAL FOSTER PARENT CYPM TRAINING DATES (2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Series 1</th>
<th>Series 2</th>
<th>Series 3</th>
<th>Series 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 19</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Participants: Total 122
Prince George’s County Foster Parents are Educated to:

• Create a supportive and safe environment for the foster youth
• Contact the youth’s social worker immediately if a foster care youth is arrested
• Forward mail to the agency related to a previous arrest of any foster care youth
• Attend relevant hearings for a foster care youth
Perspective from the Field: Lucas County, OH

Honorable Denise Cubbon
Lucas County Crossover Youth Project

A collaboration between Lucas County Juvenile Court and Lucas County Children Services

ssw.umaryland.edu/traininginstitutes
Lucas County, Ohio

Demographics

Toledo is the county seat of Lucas County, Ohio.

2015 Population Estimate: 433,689 people

Youth population between 10 - 18: 44,882

Lucas county population retrieved
http://factfinder.census.gov/bkmk/table/1.0/en/PEP/2015/PEPANNRES/0500000US39095
Youth Population Source: http://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/ezapop/
Overarching Goals of the Lucas County CYPM

- Reduction in the number of youth placed in out-of-home care
- Reduction in the use of congregate care
- Reduction in the disproportionate representation of children of color
- Reduction in the number of youth crossing over and/or becoming dually adjudicated
Supporting Process Goals

• To increase the use of interagency information-sharing
• To increase the use of “joint” assessment
• To increase the inclusion of youth and family voice in decision-making
CYPM in Lucas County

Target Population:

- Open LCCS case
  - Custody, Non-Custody, Post Adopt
- 9-17 years old
- Involvement in the Juvenile Justice System Diversion, or any Lucas County Juvenile Justice court filing or booking

ssw.umaryland.edu/traininginstitutes
Referrals

• 2012 referrals: 24
• 2014 referrals: 86
• 2016 referrals: 92
• 2017 referrals: 98
Help Desk Notification

• Youth is dually involved (Open LCCS case and LCJC Delinquency or Unruly Filing between the ages of 7 and 18 years of age and is actively being serviced by both agencies.

• LCCS Representatives will notify LCCS Liaison if the case is closed, closing or in the assessment process
Team Identified

- Includes Assigned Court Officer (PO, Misdemeanor Services or Assessment Center Officer), LCCS Caseworker, CASA/GAL, Service Providers, Supervisors, LCCS representative and LCCS Liaison
- Group Email Sent
Crossover Process Begins

- Joint Home Visits
- Crossover Conference scheduled by the LCCS Liaison
- Attend Hearings
- Monthly Joint Visits
- 90 Day Review/Crossover Conference scheduled with LCCS coordinator
- Additional conferences scheduled with the LCCS Liaison if major changes occur
Who should Participate in the Crossover Youth Conferences?

The following individuals must participate in the Crossover Youth Conference (mandatory participants):

- Youth
- Parents/Custodian (unless youth is in Permanent Custody status)
- LCCS Worker
- LCJC Assigned Officer (Probation Officer, Misdemeanor Services Officer or Assessment Center Officer)
- GAL and/or CASA
- Facilitator
Lucas County Assessment Center Efforts began in 2012
Lucas County Executive Team Vision
Original 2012 Team

Lucas County is committed to keeping the community safe through evidenced based screenings, assessments and meaningful interventions for each child and family.

Denise Cubbon, Administrative Judge
Connie F. Zemmelman, Judge
Chief Derrick Diggs
Captain George Kral
Chief Michael Navarre
Lieutenant Hank Everitt
Director Jon Rogers
Sheriff John Tharp
Prosecutor Julia Bates
Assistant Prosecutor Lori Olender
Steve Anthony, Toledo Area Ministries
Carol Contrada, Lucas County Commissioner
Romules Durant, Superintendent
Brian Murphy, Assistant Superintendent
Deborah Hodges, Court Administrator
Kendra Kec, Assistant Court Administrator
David Kontur, Executive Director of Family Council
Dean Sparks, Executive Director of Children Services
Deb Ortiz, Executive Director of Jobs and Family Services
John Trunk, Executive Director Board of Developmental Disabilities
Scott Sylak, Executive Director of Mental Health/Recovery Services Board
Doni Miller, Chief Executive Officer of Neighborhood Health Association
Annette Clark, Director of Lucas County Family Services of Northwest Ohio

ssw.umaryland.edu/traininginstitutes
## Most Prevalent Charges on Complaint at the Assessment Center in 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charge on Complaint</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Total *</th>
<th>Rate of Black Youth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unruly</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe School Ordinance</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstruction Official Business</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runaway Warrant</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrant - Green</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorderly Conduct</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Trespass</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total includes Latino, Other and Unknown
HBO VICE "Raised in the System"

ssw.umaryland.edu/traininginstitutes
Assessment Center Process

- OYAS (Ohio Youth Assessment System) Diversion Tool
- SBIRT – Screening and Brief Intervention and Referral to Treatment
- Public Health Screener and Linkage
- Juvenile Human Trafficking Tool
- Referral to Community Partners
- Referral to Safety Net
- Divert Unofficial Cases, Set Official Cases for Hearing
Arrested Youth Booked into Detention vs Arrested Youth Served in the Assessment Center

- Since 2009, the Detention Center has seen a 78% decrease in booking.
- In 2017, the Assessment Center served more youth than the Detention Center.
Black youth arrested for SSO and booked into the Detention Center has decreased 99% since 2009 going from 359 to 4.
Notable facts:

- 45% of youth reported current involvement with a mental health provider.
- 74% of youth reported current or past involvement with a mental health provider.
2017 Assessment Center Youth Reported Involvement with Lucas County Children Services

- 21% of youth reported current involvement with Lucas County Children Services.
- 51% of youth reported current or past involvement with Lucas County Children Services.
To further focus the framework of PYJ, researchers propose six practice domains.

Work: Experience, apprenticeships, employment readiness, income and independence

Education: Literacy, credentials, learning skills, career planning

Health: Physical activity, diet and nutrition, mental and behavioral health, lifestyle

Relationships: Communication skills, conflict resolution, family systems, intimacy and support

Community: Civic engagement, community leadership, services, responsibility

Creativity: Personal expression, visual arts, performing arts, language arts

Understanding that youth are a resource to us, we then seek to positively intervene with opportunities for them to **Learn & Do** as well as **Attach & Belong**.

**Learning/Doing**
- Develop new skills
- Actively get to use new skills
- Take on new roles and responsibilities
- Develop self-efficacy and personal confidence

**Attaching/Belonging**
- Become an active part of a pro-social group
- Develop and enjoy a sense of belonging
- Place high value on service to other and being part of the community


[ssw.umaryland.edu/traininginstitutes](ssw.umaryland.edu/traininginstitutes)
Through community partnership justice involved youth can learn new skills and connect with positive adults in the community beyond the Court.
We propose that Positive Youth Justice can be infused in programming & interactions with youth at any point in the juvenile justice system.

In collaboration with The Toledo Museum Of Art young people explore creative outlets.

Here a youth in placement creates while his mother looks on.
Table Top Discussion:

What are the areas of improvement your jurisdiction can begin to tackle to understand or address the needs of this population?
Contact Information

Hon Denise Cubbon
Lucas County, OH
Dcubbo@co.lucas.oh.us
419-213-6778

Walter Jackson
DHS - Prince George’s County, MD
walter.jackson@maryland.gov
301-909-2017

Macon Stewart
Georgetown University CJJR
Macon.Stewart@georgetown.edu
980-330-3319

Cynthia Stolz
Allegheny County, PA
Cynthia.Stoltz@alleghenycourts.us
412-350-0377

Denise Sulzbach
TA Network
dsulzbach@ssw.umd.edu
410-706-3364

Kwabena Tuffour
DJS –Prince George’s County, MD
kwabena.tuffour@maryland.gov
301-952-2591