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It is our hope that the Policy Guide that follows will provide valuable recommendations for policy makers at all levels of government to advance the objectives of increasing collaboration among the child welfare, juvenile justice, and other youth serving systems to improve outcomes for youth and families.

This report was made possible with the support of Casey Family Programs, whose mission is to provide, improve – and ultimately prevent the need for – foster care. The findings and conclusions presented in this report are those of the author(s) alone, and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of Casey Family Programs.
There is clear evidence that abused and neglected youth in the child welfare system are at higher risk for subsequent involvement with the juvenile justice system. Research indicates that maltreatment of an adolescent is causally related to later delinquency, including serious and violent offending. The costs to the youth, their families and communities are high, including significantly poorer life prospects than for most other youth, expensive out-of-home placement, high rates of recidivism, and the victimization of community members. Coordinated and targeted work across multiple systems offers opportunities to prevent youth from crossing over to the juvenile justice system, and to treat them more successfully when they do enter that system. The task is large, but hardly impossible.

Action from the national policy level to the individual case practice level in the child welfare and juvenile justice systems to better serve “crossover youth” will result in improved outcomes for those youth who move back and forth between these systems. So that the opportunities afforded most youth are experienced by the crossover population, the systems need strengthening to provide appropriate and uninterrupted services to youth who transition across these service boundaries. The lack of continuity, the disruption of education and the breaking of familial, cultural and community bonds causes further trauma to already damaged children and their families.

The child welfare and juvenile justice systems are only parts of larger child-serving systems. Youth served by child welfare and juvenile justice also need educational, health and behavioral health services, as do many children, but to a far greater degree than most other youth. What distinguishes child welfare and juvenile justice from these other helping systems is the potential intrusiveness of their interventions; no other systems remove youth from their homes involuntarily and separate them from parents and, often, communities. It is the potential for this disruption that demands that these systems be held accountable, and it is the movement of youth between these two systems that is the focus of this work.
Research shows us that maltreatment results in a higher risk of a variety of negative outcomes for our children. Furthermore, children whose abuse persists into adolescence, or who are originally abused during adolescence, are at higher risk still for involvement with justice systems later in their lives.

Operationally, as these crossover youth move between both systems, in either direction, they and their families often lose continuity of services, representation, judges who know their cases, and even the focus of intervention. Roles change from victim to perpetrator and back, with a changing array of providers, practitioners and, sometimes, even parents.

The need for collaboration among and between systems is not a new concept, but for this population of youth it is essential. Cross-system collaboration is needed to reduce movement across these systems, and to facilitate a more seamless transfer when it does occur. While some might argue that single, integrated systems that incorporate both sectors are needed, the reality is that most child welfare and juvenile justice systems are separate and policy action is required to strengthen the interaction between these systems and among allied service systems. Thus, the sponsors of this Wingspread conference are committed to highlighting the issues, the need and the potential solutions so that all children and youth, including this uniquely vulnerable population, have access to the supports necessary for a successful future.

**A. Purpose and Reason**

The Sponsors believe that a strong policy framework must precede action so as to align and amplify the necessary work. To achieve this, several complementary steps were needed in order to develop a useful policy agenda. Each of these steps produced a document that will continue to advance this work:

First was the commissioning of a paper that reviewed the current state of multi-system collaboration and the body of research that exists on crossover youth. This paper, “Building Multisystem Approaches in Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice,” also included a survey of states to determine the extent to which jurisdictions recognized and quantified the crossover population. This paper grounded the work at Wingspread and will continue to illustrate the scope of the presenting problem. The full text is found in Section III.

Next was the convening of a body of experts at The Johnson Foundation’s Wingspread Conference Center. This group, comprised of experts on child welfare, juvenile justice, the courts, education, mental health, consumers and other related sectors, were provided an opportunity to read the paper and then come together to debate and discuss the creation of a policy agenda. The Proceedings of this gathering is found in Section IV.

Finally, the result of these discussions and of continued collaboration since the conference is the policy agenda itself. It specifies key policy options at the national, state, tribal and local levels to advance this agenda. The Policy Guide is the culmination of this effort. It is Section II of this document.
As noted in the paper commissioned for this conference, there is little guidance to the field on how to improve services to crossover youth and their families. The paper, the convening at Wingspread and the resulting Policy Guide represent a combined effort by the Sponsors to create a policy action agenda to improve outcomes for this population. Regardless of one’s role or the arena in which one works, there are opportunities to improve the policy environment in a manner that promotes better outcomes for these youth.

Whether looked at fiscally, developmentally, programmatically or morally, the case is compelling. Once youth cross from one system to another, their life prospects diminish markedly, and the public burden increases dramatically over the long term. There is no lack of money being spent on crossover youth; it is primarily spent too late and to meet mostly community safety concerns. Early, coordinated and effective action can mitigate this. A policy environment that encourages, allows and, in fact, demands better outcomes for crossover youth is the intent of this collaboration.

B. Values, Beliefs and Underlying Philosophy that Guides the Policy Agenda

Following are the values, beliefs and the underlying philosophy that Wingspread attendees agreed form the basis for the policy agenda that emerged from this gathering.

1) The purpose of child serving systems is to understand and meet children’s unique needs.
   • Children are children regardless of the system they enter—and need to be treated accordingly.
   • Consider “if this were my child how would I want them to be treated?”
   • Think of the child first and organize agency law, policy, contracts and practice accordingly.
   • Children and families have strengths and we need to learn about these strengths in order to effectively meet their needs.
   • Every youth is unique, has potential and is to be served individually based on their history and experiences, their gender, culture, race, ethnicity, age and developmental status.
   • Children do not stop needing supports when they turn 18—our policies recognize child development through adulthood (adolescent transition).
   • The “victim/predator” dichotomy is not a helpful construct in serving children.
   • Crossover status is conferred by movement in either direction, that is, from child welfare to juvenile justice or from juvenile justice to child welfare.

2) Children belong in families.
   • We do not narrowly define family—we include all forms and definitions of family (as defined by the family and/or youth).
   • In order to help children stay in families, we build capacity within families.
   • Families and youth have a voice in planning for their own lives.
   • Group/congregate care is for treatment when effective treatment cannot be provided in the community and not a place for children to grow up (as short as time as possible with maximum treatment benefit).
There is a policy preference for “close to home” (preventive services, placement, etc.). Community partners are engaged in supporting families. All children need permanency. This includes creating a family for children who have none. Finding and supporting families is critical; there is a preference for kinship care with appropriate supports. Active family locator services are used. Children need to live in stable environments (placement stabilization). Strengths-based work is the approach of choice. Educational stability is a key to permanency.

3) Culture, race and ethnicity of children and families must inform policy and practice.
   - Policy development and accompanying practice focused on crossover youth and their families honors and respects the varying beliefs, values, and family practices of different cultural, racial, religious, and ethnic groups.
   - A culturally competent/responsive approach to frame and evaluate policy and practice is evident.
   - System practices improve and ultimately guarantee equal treatment outcomes for all youth and families regardless of race, ethnicity and national origin.
   - Eliminate disproportionality and disparate outcomes as they relate to the need for, access to, utilization of and quality of services received by children of color.

4) The intentional and meaningful involvement of families and youth in policy and practice development and all service delivery and governance is expected and desirable.
   - Families and youth are involved in system design, implementation, evaluation and oversight.
   - Family and youth are equal partners at all levels of development.
   - Avoid tokenism; every family every time.
   - All families have strengths.
   - Information is shared with families.
   - Families are compensated and rewarded for their investment of time in policy and practice development activities.
   - Family voice and family choice are supported where it does not compromise child safety.
   - An actionable voice for families and youth is developed and sustained in court proceedings.
   - Systems of care philosophies and service strategies are evident.
   - One family/one plan.

5) Service development and utilization must be driven by a common set of outcomes and be informed by data and evidence.
   - Shared outcomes and values around safety drive child welfare and juvenile justice in order to integrate the policy and practice of each system.
     - A child safety focus does not impede attention to well being.
     - A public safety focus does not preclude attention to well being.
• Sound research and evidence result in effective investment of resources that is culturally and gender responsive.
• Privacy is to be protected.
• Performance measures and accountability in practice are system expectations.
• Savings generated from cost reductions are reinvested.
• Evaluation is a fundamental part of program planning.
• Integrated planning for services crosses all systems.
• Good stewardship of resources results in a cost benefit that is a political necessity.
• Data tell us that most children go home, so investments are made in community-based support to families (broadly defined) rather than deep-end services.
• Funding and resources are blended.
• We learn from the resiliency factors of children who do not crossover in an effort to inform our work with children who do.
• Community based providers agree with the common mission and values, and contracts are designed so that the implementation of practices are consistent with this common mission and values.
• Common terms and definitions are promoted.

6) **Build the knowledge base, skill development and the capacity of individuals doing the work and youth and families served by the system.**

• Staff, professionals, volunteers, and system partners (formal and informal) are cross-trained in understanding the data and evidence around what causes children to crossover into another system.
• Work is approached from a child developmental perspective.
• People doing the work are valued.
• Decisions are made in the best interests of children and families.
• The focus of work is to develop community understanding and expand the knowledge base for working with families.
• University partners are engaged in building the knowledge base.
• Organizational capacity is a recognized component of supporting effective practices. This includes both staff and leadership development.
• Policy makers are informed and educated about systems of care and performance.

7) **All children, youth and families deserve equal protections and access to services regardless of jurisdiction.**

• Tribal government jurisdiction is recognized and Tribes should be equal providers of child welfare and juvenile justice services.
• The full faith and credit of tribal court orders and acts as required by the Indian Child Welfare Act should extend to juvenile justice.
• The basic protections of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act should extend to Federal and Tribal facilities.
• Equal access to federal funding streams that support child welfare and juvenile justice should be provided to all.
C. Desired Outcomes

When the policy agenda for crossover youth and their families is fully implemented, these are the desired outcomes for the child-serving systems. Detailed policy action areas are described for each of these outcome areas in the Policy Guide, found in Section II.

1. **Strategic Partnerships** are developed and supported.
2. **Information, Data and Outcomes** are shared, as appropriate, among agencies.
3. **Families and Youth Are Meaningfully Engaged** in system design and implementation.
4. **Financing Strategies** are integrated and coordinated across agencies.
5. Jointly developed **Practice Models** are clearly articulated and supported in practice.
6. All systems understand the importance of, and actively support investments in, **Research and Evaluation**.

D. The Sponsors

*Casey Family Programs (CFP)*, an operating foundation based in Seattle, Washington, is the largest foundation in the country focused on the well-being of this nation's children who are in, or at risk of entering foster care. It is increasing its outreach to communities across the country in an effort to support systems change and improvement that will further its 2020 Outcome Goals.

*The American Public Human Services Association (APHSA)* is the nation's most prominent and influential organization focused on the delivery of human services. Its membership is comprised of every state's human services department and its various subdivisions. Its National Association of Public Child Welfare Administrators recently determined that this multi-systems issue as it impacts children in the child welfare and juvenile justice systems will be one of its primary areas of focus over the next several years.

The Georgetown University Public Policy Institute's *Center for Juvenile Justice Reform (CJJR)* is designed to support public agency officials in pursuing multi-systems strategies that would strengthen the juvenile justice and related systems of care.

A conference designed to facilitate a dialogue about crossover youth was convened by APHSA, the CFP and the CJJR, in partnership with *The Johnson Foundation*, in May 2008. This conference was held at the Foundation’s Wingspread Conference Center in Racine, Wisconsin on the western shore of Lake Michigan.
Crossover Youth and Policy Making

This Guide is intended to provide the primary options for formal policy development and implementation at the federal, tribal, state\(^1\) and local levels on behalf of youth who cross over from child welfare to juvenile justice, or from juvenile justice to the child welfare system. Action across all levels of government is needed to effect critical and necessary reforms. The foundation for the Guide is that policy and service development must be driven by a common set of outcomes, informed by data and evidence, and reflect the meaningful involvement of families, youth, community partners and advocates.

Policy Makers, Implementers, and Stakeholders

Formal policy makers are the government officials and legislators who establish the policy framework of rules, regulations and funding which form the structure for the delivery of services. Implementation of policy occurs at the state and local levels through networks of public and private service providers. Stakeholders, including advocates and community-based partners, are integral in advancing this work and they need to be privy to, and active in, the policy arena. Leadership from among all of these groups, both formal and informal, is critical to the success of the crossover youth served by the systems. Chief among these are the crossover youth and their families themselves whose input is essential in policy development and implementation.

Government policies are most effective when they are integrated with the community structures that families know and trust. Community-based partners, identified as the natural helping “structures” that exist in communities, include faith-based and service-oriented providers, neighborhood coalitions, and institutions. These structures can provide strong opportunities for an informed voice in policy development through their reflection of the culture and values of youth and families. As a result, this Guide emphasizes the inclusion of community-based partners in policy development and implementation.

Advocates assume many roles in policy making. These include sharply framing a position through effective communication strategies, developing legislative language, funding lobbying efforts, and initiating litigation. For crossover youth issues, advocates can create a bridge for policymakers and communities through a voice that is complementary to, and not a substitute for, youth and families.

\(^1\)Policy recommendations are made at the level that appears most appropriate for the majority of jurisdictions. However, policy recommendations may be appropriate for other levels in certain places. E.g., recommendations that are identified at the state level may apply to county-level government in the 13 states that have county-administered child welfare systems. Similarly, recommendations may be more easily implemented in systems where umbrella agencies span both child welfare and juvenile justice. Finally, juvenile justice and child welfare “systems” frequently encompass state, local and private components, regardless of how the states are formally administered.
Using the Guide

The policy action areas listed below represent recommendations on a variety of fronts. Action is possible and desirable in and across all policy areas. The format of the Guide is not intended to prescribe a linear or a “top down” approach to issues related to crossover youth and their families. Rather, it is recognized that leadership and vision can, and often do, emerge from any and all sectors. The goal is coordinated engagement across all levels to achieve maximum impact and promote improved outcomes for crossover youth.

Note: The recommended policy actions are organized here by action area, with federal, state/tribal, local and program recommendations listed under each area. A helpful view of these recommendations across each level (i.e., a listing of all the federal recommended actions for all the action areas, followed by all state/tribal actions, etc.) may be found in a matrix at the end of the Policy Guide.

Policy Action Areas

1.) Strategic partnerships are developed and supported.

Strategic partnerships to support crossover youth and their families should be developed at the federal, as well as at the state and local levels. Effective strategic partnerships require at least the following:

- Committed leadership who remain actively engaged in the partnership.
- Shared data to develop a common understanding of the extent of the crossover youth population.
- Shared outcomes to measure progress.
- Shared resources, including staff and funding.
- Shared authority.
- Work that is grounded in evidence or committed to improving the evidence base.

2.) Information, data and outcomes are shared, as appropriate, among agencies.

Data system development must encourage flexible exchange of data; system inflexibility can never be the reason that data are not shared. Data must be readily accessible to systems that have a legitimate claim in working with crossover youth. This does not imply unrestricted access to all data, but rather a diligent identification of what data are needed and why, consistent with privacy protections around access and re-disclosure. Currently, data about crossover youth are not
sufficiently available at the federal, state, or local levels; a coherent and comprehensive data collection and reporting strategy is needed. In the aggregate, more appropriate service system changes can be made only when there is a clear understanding of the size and demographics of this population of interest. At the individual case level, service providers can be most effective when all needed information is available to understand the case in context.

3.) **Families and youth are meaningfully engaged in system design and implementation.**

Meaningful input from families and youth at the case level is increasingly expected and commonly promoted in practice models. Such input fosters improved services based upon the families’ needs and progress toward goals. “Family”, for the purposes of this Guide, is defined broadly to include extended family members and fictive kin. Parent and youth involvement at the policy level while not yet commonplace provides a critical opportunity for policy makers to understand the issues through the true experts, families and youth with firsthand knowledge of the crossover experience.

Policy makers must find new and more meaningful ways to hear from parents and youth who are representative of crossover families in terms of race, ethnicity, culture and experience, avoiding tokenism and co-optation. This will require a commitment of resources to reach out to parents who do not currently have a voice, including: incarcerated parents; those struggling with substance abuse or mental health issues; parents whose education, employment and legal issues are barriers to quality family life; and those struggling to meet their basic needs for food and shelter.

4.) **Financing strategies are integrated and coordinated across agencies.**

Integrating and coordinating current financing across service systems can produce efficiencies and savings in both the short and long term. Other systems with a responsibility to serve youth in the child welfare and juvenile justice systems, including education, behavioral health and substance abuse policy makers and service providers, should be full participants in this process. Clarity about the amount and purpose of current investments, as well as consistent measurement of desired outcomes from these investments help inform future financing and reinvestment strategies.

However, strategies to achieve efficiencies within current funding will not be sufficient to support improved outcomes for crossover youth and their families; additional federal funds are needed. An expansion of federal funding from Titles IV-E (foster care and adoption assistance) and IV-B (child welfare services) of the Social Security Act, as well as Medicaid, is needed to support this population. Additional flexibility within existing funding streams at all levels is needed to support innovation and testing of new models, including reinvestment models that are responsive to local needs.

---

2 Fictive Kin is defined as individuals that are unrelated but have the characteristics of a family relationship, such as “god parents”.
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5.) *Jointly developed practice models are clearly articulated and supported in practice.*

Crossover youth and their families are best supported when a model of practice is explicitly outlined. Effective practice models specify the population to be served, the interventions to be supported, the ways in which work is to proceed and why, and the intended short and long-term outcomes. The role of partner agencies and systems, including education, behavioral health and substance abuse treatment, should be developed collaboratively and made explicit in a practice model. The more clearly the practice model is specified, the tighter the links are to on-going research and the clearer the strategy is for tracking outcomes. This rigorous approach serves parents and youth best because it is explicit, creates a system that holds itself accountable, and offers structured opportunities for self-correction and continuous improvement.

6.) *All systems understand the importance of, and actively support, investments in research and evaluation.*

Systematic investment in research and evaluation guides the elements of the practice agenda and directs investment strategies. A consistent pursuit of the question of what works and for whom, both in the funding and in the participation in research and evaluation, leads to continuous improvement in methodologies and yields improvements in outcomes for youth and their families. The returns on these investments are both qualitative and quantitative.
Recommended Policy Actions

1. **Strategic partnerships are developed and supported.**

**Federal Role:** *(White House, Congress, Executive Agencies)*

Federal leadership can model the partnerships and organizational behaviors expected at the state and local levels. The benefits of shared outcomes, interdisciplinary work and co-location that can improve agency collaboration locally can be demonstrated at the federal level as well as provide direction and support for collaborative work across child welfare and juvenile justice systems.

**Recommended Policy Actions:**

- Amend the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDPA) and the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA) to further require cross-agency collaboration at the federal, state and local levels focused on improving outcomes for crossover youth.
- Amend CAPTA and JJDPA to require that state plans address crossover youth issues.  
- Direct current federal interagency structures to support cross-agency/cross-program collaboration to achieve better outcomes for crossover youth.
- Direct cross-agency action to support state and local targeting of delivery of services to crossover youth including demonstrations grants, technical assistance and training grants.

**State Role:** *(Governor, State Legislature, Tribal Governments, Courts, State Agencies)*

Just as with federal agencies, state action can model what is being expected locally. When issues are identified inter-departmentally, solutions will cross departments and result in more effective strategies for improving outcomes for crossover youth and their families.

**Recommended Policy Actions:**

- Establish interagency structures to support cross-agency/cross-program collaboration.

---

3 This will be more costly and challenging for some states than others and will likely require additional resources. In many areas, state plans will need to accommodate services and administration of state, local and private entities.

4 A Children’s Cabinet at the federal level should include the Departments of Health and Human Services (DHHS), Justice, Labor and Education. Within DHHS, at a minimum, the Children’s Bureau and the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) should be included.

5 This includes all child-serving executive and state-level agencies, including Child Welfare, Juvenile Justice, Departments of Education, Behavioral Health and Substance Abuse Services.

6 Examples of such structures include a cross-agency Children’s Cabinet and multi-tiered, collaborative, vertical structures, e.g. multi-disciplinary case teams that identify systemic issues and communicate them to regional and statewide structures.
• Require agencies to provide integrated reporting on crossover youth.
• Require agencies to plan, coordinate and monitor the delivery of integrated services along the full continuum of care.
• Require that the programs, policies and budgets of the agencies are coordinated to ensure the effective, efficient, and comprehensive delivery of services.

Local Role: (County Manager/Board, Mayor, City Council, Educational Service Agencies, School Superintendents/Boards)

Local entities often have significant discretion in organizing how work gets done. These entities serve many of the same constituencies and can readily create opportunities for better-coordinated interdisciplinary work.

Recommended Policy Actions:

• Establish or identify existing organizational, governance, and decision-making structures to support cross-agency/cross-program collaboration and joint assessments of resource and service needs. Examples include joint planning committees and service delivery teams.

Court and Agency Role: (CW and JJ agencies, Courts, Law Enforcement, Education, Behavioral Health and Substance Abuse Services)

Agency policies and practice models should require and value interdisciplinary work. Management philosophies anchored in cross-agency performance measurement and improvement strategies promote shared responsibility and better youth and family outcomes.

Recommended Policy Actions:

• Co-locate staff and programs.
• Cross train across all allied agencies, including staff, managers and judges.
• Establish or identify existing structures to support cross-program collaboration for identification of crossover youth, service delivery (e.g. multi-disciplinary service teams) and case planning (e.g., court-program collaboration).
• Coordinate cross-agency development and use of joint youth and family assessments.
• Courts order joint recommendations from child welfare and juvenile justice.
• Develop hiring guidelines that require youth development expertise for staff positions working with adolescents.
• Collaborate with university partners to embed youth development theory, policy and practice in graduate and undergraduate curricula.
• Develop memoranda of understanding (MOU’s) between agencies to eliminate barriers and foster closer working relationships.
Substantive work has been done in child welfare and juvenile justice to set the national policy agenda. The JJDPA and CAPTA encourage and, in places, require sharing of information and the identification of crossover youth. Other federal initiatives can readily support this effort once barriers and disincentives are identified and eliminated. Executive agencies can ensure a clear understanding regarding privacy and confidentiality provisions of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) and the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). Opportunities exist to strengthen statutes and take administrative action to better inform the incidence, case characteristics, and service array discussions regarding crossover youth.

**Federal Role: (White House, Congress, Executive Agencies)**

Recommended policy actions:

- Amend the JJDPA to encourage joint planning and cross-systems collaboration.
- Enforce the CAPTA requirements to gather statistics on youth who cross over from child welfare to juvenile justice.
- Mandate data sharing among child welfare, juvenile justice and education systems through legislative reauthorization of CAPTA, JJDPA, FERPA and IDEA.
- Require review and elimination of federal barriers to data access consistent with privacy policies that protect use, maintenance, re-disclosure and, ultimately, expungement of data.
- Revise Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information Systems (SACWIS) requirements to facilitate virtual sharing across technological platforms, with an exemption if the data on crossover youth and youth at risk of crossing over is available through the state’s juvenile justice information system.\(^7\)
- Fund data sharing mandates, including development, training and change management costs.
- Mandate statistics about crossover youth to be part of states’ self-assessment in the Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) during the reauthorization of the Adoption and Safe Families Act (ASFA).

**State Role: (Governor, State Legislature, Tribal Governments, Courts, State Agencies)**

The state role includes implementation of federal policy with regard to data sharing and confidentiality. Governors, legislatures, tribal governments and the courts have latitude in

---

\(^7\) Current SACWIS rules require all child welfare data to be on a single technology platform. Juvenile Justice systems are often found in other agencies, and exchanging data with external systems can jeopardize federal support. Full bi-directional data exchange is needed and recommended. Medicaid Information Technology Architecture (MITA) grants are good examples of constructive federal support for interoperable systems.
many of these policy areas and can readily take action within current federal policy to advance this agenda.

Recommended Policy Actions:

- Direct executive agencies to share data about crossover youth and develop shared or integrated information technology (IT) systems.
- Direct a review and elimination of agency administrative barriers to sharing data, consistent with appropriate privacy policies.
- Direct a review and elimination of barriers created by state statute and regulation, consistent with appropriate privacy policies.
- Require the collection, reporting, and monitoring of crossover statistics.
- Require the production, reporting, and monitoring of measures of repeat maltreatment and rates of adolescent maltreatment.\(^8\)
- Direct a review of all possible funding options for shared or integrated IT systems, including pooled or blended agency funding.
- Require that crossover youth be included in the building of state National Youth in Transition Database (NYTD) tracking systems.
- Modify judicial “bench books”, which provide guidance to judges, to include information for judges about the sharing and utilization of child welfare, juvenile justice and education records in developing joint case planning, management and service delivery.

**Local Role: (County Manager/Board, Mayor, City Council, Educational Service Agencies, School Superintendents/Boards)**

In addition to the potential negative outcomes for crossover youth themselves, these youth represent a large financial burden without early, effective intervention. Often, jurisdictions are aware of these costs only after the fact. Information sharing to identify crossover youth and youth at-risk of crossover guides prevention and diversion strategies and provides opportunities for developing investment and reinvestment strategies.

Recommended Policy Actions:

- Direct agencies and contractors to share information.
- Provide local match for IT systems.
- Identify all funding options for shared or integrated IT systems, including requiring agencies to share or blend funding.
- Engage law enforcement and school superintendents/boards in information sharing including research and statistics.

\(^8\) As these measures are predictors of involvement with the juvenile justice system, they are critical crossover statistics.
Court and Agency Role: (CW and JJ agencies, Courts, Law Enforcement, Education, Behavioral Health and Substance Abuse Services)

It is at the agency and court level that work with individual families is done and the interpretation and implementation of policy occurs. Multi-disciplinary work is better focused and, ultimately, more successful, in an arena where data can and are being shared. A clear understanding of the purpose of data sharing and ensuring that privacy issues, including re-disclosure rules, are specifically addressed facilitates the sharing of data.

Recommended Policy Actions:

- Develop system indicators of prior child welfare or juvenile justice involvement for youth entering either system starting at the point of referral, arrest or detention.
- Develop protocols and MOU’s governing how data are shared, stored, re-disclosed and expunged.
- Use court orders when necessary to mandate records sharing.
- Develop and track outcome measures and support ongoing information quality assessment programs.
- Track the incidence and prevalence of maltreatment, by age and over time (risk population for crossing over).
Federal Role: (White House, Congress, Executive Agencies)

Federal entities are far removed from individual case practice, but that should not preclude them from meeting face-to-face with youth and families. Federal leadership can ensure youth and family participation through statute and regulation and establish opportunities to include youth and families in the policy-making process. The power of personal stories is an important complement to aggregate data about families and service systems.

Recommended Policy Actions:

- Require the inclusion of crossover youth and families during the CFSR review process.
- Issue Proclamations that promote the value of family and youth involvement in policy and practice issues.
- Require the creation of an inter-agency Parent and Youth Council focused exclusively on crossover youth issues.
- Add family and youth representatives to current interagency structures/councils.
- Require meaningful parent and youth impact assessments and statements for legislative and regulatory proposals.
- Amend CAPTA and JJDPA to require family and youth participation in service planning and court proceedings at all decision points along the case continuum.
- Require a review of funding and grant programs to create a mechanism to financially support youth and family participation at federal, state and local levels.

State Role: (Governor, State Legislature, Tribal Governments, Courts, State Agencies)

As with the federal level, there are many opportunities to include the voice of youth and families in policy formulation and specification at the state level. Parents and youth can offer insight into potential unintended consequences and anchor policy action in outcomes based upon real experiences.

Recommended Policy Actions:

- All of the items listed above for federal level.
- Establish or strengthen parent and youth legislative advisory councils, and ensure representation from the crossover population, to provide recommendations and review legislative and budget proposals.
- Establish or strengthen parent and youth boards, and ensure representation from the crossover population, to advise the Governor at regular intervals on family and youth policy and budget development.
- Establish or strengthen parent and youth advisory committees to the child-serving agencies, and ensure representation from the crossover population.
• Require that agencies provide leadership opportunities for parents and youth within agency workgroups and committees that allow them to encourage and direct the development of agency programs and policies
• Require that all programs and policies become youth and family centered, focused on the development of supports that meet the needs identified by families and youth
• Create an ombudsman function to include a focus on crossover youth issues.

**Local Role: (County Manager/Board, Mayor, City Council, Educational Service Agencies, School Superintendents/Boards)**

At the local levels, policy meets practice and can support the inclusion of families and youth in all forums where decisions about them are made.

Recommended Policy Actions:

• All of the items listed for federal and state levels.

**Court and Agency Role: (CW and JJ agencies, Courts, Law Enforcement, Education, Behavioral Health and Substance Abuse Services)**

Here, the policy preference for inclusion and engagement of youth and families can be implemented at both the case level and the policy level. Meaningful inclusion requires active listening, respect and, where appropriate, mentoring to assure informed participation.

Recommended Policy Actions:

• Encourage families, broadly defined, to become involved in system design and implementation.
• Develop and cultivate a meaningful family representation on Advisory Boards that review policies, procedures and proposals.
• Provide training for family members on court proceedings, educational procedures, case planning and placement decisions. This training should include advocacy skills and appeals processes.
• Ensure that all case plans are family and youth driven, including an educational/vocational plan grounded in a strengths-based, current assessment.
• Ensure that youth are adequately represented by counsel.
• Ensure that families and youth are adequately represented in educational proceedings.
• Require that, as appropriate, all crossover youth and their families attend all court hearings and are meaningfully involved in that process.
• Require customer satisfaction measures across all programs.
4. Financing strategies are integrated and coordinated across agencies.

**Federal Role: (White House, Congress, Executive Agencies)**

Federal funding streams are aggressively managed within program areas. Almost by definition, youth who crossover (in either direction) break funding relationships and often lose connection to service providers, attorneys, judges and advocates. As many of these youth still require the same or more intensive services as were being received in the previous system, and may well return to that same system in time, preservation of continuity of services, regardless of dependency or delinquency status, is imperative. Federal leadership can establish eligibility standards and funding streams that allow crossover youth and their families to receive services seamlessly and ensure the continuity of representation in either system.

**Recommended Policy Actions:**

- Require the funding of joint federal initiatives, including demonstration projects and training and technical assistance initiatives, to support the crossover populations.
- Expand IV-B funding to create an additional allocation to prevent the crossover of youth from child welfare to juvenile justice.
- Require the development of financing mechanisms that allow reinvestment of savings from unused residential care days in either child welfare or juvenile justice due to the prevention of placement or reduced lengths of stay.
- Direct an examination and elimination of federal barriers, including categorical funding restrictions to training administrators, providers and key stakeholders across systems.
- Extend full, enhanced IV-E training reimbursement for staff providing services targeted at crossover youth, whether private or public employees.
- Provide fiscal incentives to states to reduce the rate of youth crossing over between the child welfare and juvenile justice systems including the development of national outcomes measures and standards to track state performance.
- Extend Medicaid eligibility to all crossover youth while in the juvenile justice system.
- Expand funding through Title V of the JJDPA to support collaborative efforts designed to prevent children and youth from crossing over.
- Extend NCLB fiscal support to youth who have dropped out of school and are obtaining a GED.

---

9 These savings could be reinvested in either system to serve crossover youth, especially in non-residential, family-focused, evidence-based programs. IV-E waiver demonstrations were successful in promoting innovative child welfare program development, and adding to the research base.

10 A combination of funded incentives and specified sanctions should be developed. Sanctions should allow for disallowances to be used for system improvement within the jurisdiction. The current Food Stamps sanction system is a...
• Revise and expand current Title IV-E eligibility standards so all children and youth placed in foster care are categorically eligible for federal IV-E funding and extend this categorical eligibility to all youth who cross over to juvenile justice.  

**State Role: (Governor, State Legislature, Tribal Governments, Courts, State Agencies)**

Even with federal financing limitations, state and local funding can be pooled to address funding gaps. State entities can prioritize programs that are focused on cross-program outcomes and require interdisciplinary planning to promote collaborative funding strategies. Action at this level can inform federal policy action when outcomes are demonstrated.

**Recommended Policy Actions:**

- Direct agencies to develop coordinated methods of funding to support services either at the micro level (e.g., a child’s service plan) or at the macro level (across agencies).
- Direct agencies to review and establish funding flexibility across programs, agencies, and categorical funding streams including decategorization, pooling, and braiding resources.
- Direct the alignment of funding to support programs aimed at crossover youth and their families.
- Mandate the development of joint/shared outcomes and accountability measures related to these funding strategies.
- Require program planning and development aimed at crossover youth.
- Provide match money for systems support.

**Local Role: (County Manager/Board, Mayor, City Council, Educational Service Agencies, School Superintendents/Boards)**

As at the state level, funding service gaps with local dollars can serve families well. But coordinated local planning and reiteration of the need for flexible, integrated funding to address interdisciplinary needs is critical.

**Recommended Policy Actions:**

- Direct budgeting across programmatic silos (cross-program budgeting).
- Define desired local outcomes for crossover population and track these over time as they relate to cross-program budgeting.
- Require local planning for serving crossover youth to include:
  - Current expenditures to serve crossover youth and their families.
  - Current expenditures to prevent crossover placements.

---

11 This would support continuity of case planning and administrative supports to return youth to their home or back to child welfare as quickly as possible.
12 Integrated planning across systems, including education, is needed to develop and target effective service models for this population.
Shorten lengths of placements when they occur and promote a successful return to family, education/vocation and community.

- Develop strategies to redirect current expenditures to produce better and more timely outcomes, where appropriate.
- Identify strategies to recoup savings and areas for reinvestment.

**Court and Agency Role: (CW and JJ agencies, Courts, Law Enforcement, Education, Behavioral Health and Substance Abuse Services)**

Knowing where the investment will have the greatest impact once the funds are identified may create strong pressure for action. Funding opportunities, at times, are discretionary, and cross-agency funding can be highly dependent on trust. Seemingly small steps that build trust can translate into larger collaborative funding strategies. Co-location of staff demystifies program philosophies and agency culture, promotes staff-to-staff partnerships that promote teamwork, and opens the door to innovation and collaboration.

**Recommended Policy Actions:**

- Develop a joint reinvestment strategy with all stakeholders, including families and youth.
- Co-locate staff, equipment, etc. to strengthen cross-program support of work with crossover youth and their families.
- Quantify the downstream costs of crossover youth and potential for savings.
- Fund and create opportunities for joint training.
Federal Role: (White House, Congress, Executive Agencies)

The federal role is to promote a delineated model of practice from the states and to fund and support proven technologies that will deliver desired outcomes. Where evidence exists, federal policy should create the preference for such practice while allowing room to test other promising practices. Where evidence does not yet exist, the policy preference is toward improving the link between practice and research, and embedding that in the practice model.

Recommended Policy Actions:

- Fund cross-agency planning and implementation of a practice model aimed at addressing crossover youth issues.
- Require that other systems with a responsibility to serve crossover youth participate in the development and implementation of the practice model, including education, behavioral health and substance abuse treatment.
- Require technical assistance resource centers supported by the Department of Justice and the Department of Health and Human Services to collaborate on providing technical assistance on crossover youth.
- Require training for the workforce on a youth development model of practice designed to serve crossover youth.\(^{13}\)
- Fund national and regional “best practice” convenings.
- Request GAO studies to identify emerging practices, barriers, and opportunities.

State Role: (Governor, State Legislature, Tribal Governments, Courts, State Agencies)

Key aspects of a practice model can be advanced by legislative and executive action at the state level. Formalizing policies that promote elements of a practice model helps to align key stakeholders and leverage the work of other systems in achieving outcomes for families and youth.

Recommended Policy Actions:

- Require that agencies adopt and implement a written practice model that addresses crossover issues.
- Require that agencies’ practice models are developed with key partners at the table, including families and youth.\(^{14}\)
- Support and provide training for judges and court personnel, legislators, school officials and agency staff on the agency’s practice model.

\(^{13}\) Strategies may include loan forgiveness programs, in-service training, academies, and internships, as well as hiring criteria that emphasize specific types of education and/or work experience.

\(^{14}\) Institutional partners in developing a practice model for crossover youth must also include education, behavioral health, substance abuse and other allied services.
• Embed elements of a practice model in Executive Orders.
• Require from jurisdictions an integrated local planning process and a written plan for crossover youth.  

**Local Role: (County Manager/Board, Mayor, City Council, Educational Service Agencies, School Superintendents/Boards)**

Contracting for services locally should include a distinct policy preference for programs that can explain their expected outcomes and demonstrate that their program works. Tracking these outcomes going forward should be an expected part of service delivery. As with the state level, the array of services delivered should support and conform to the stated model of practice; this should be a requirement for any programs receiving funding or any other form of support.

**Recommended Policy Actions:**

• Require integrated planning regarding crossover youth and their families.
• Require that agencies track outcomes specified in the integrated plan and broadly disseminate these results.
• Require local agency efforts to address the issues of crossover youth and their families.
• Sponsor local colloquia, panels or other forums for discussion regarding crossover youth issues and systems integration.

**Court and Agency Role: (CW and JJ agencies, Courts, Law Enforcement, Education, Behavioral Health and Substance Abuse Services)**

So that the model of practice is institutionalized and fidelity is established, every opportunity must be taken to reinforce its elements and its use. Local directives, policy papers, protocols and other formal communication should be anchored in the policy prescriptions of the practice model. Agency actions should align with the practice model.

**Recommended Policy Actions:**

• Require the specification of a discrete practice agenda for crossover youth in the agency’s practice model.
• Align hiring practices and staff development efforts with the model of practice.
• Communicate the practice model to all staff, stakeholders, youth and families served.
• Collaborate with university partners to embed elements of the practice model in graduate and undergraduate curricula.
• Coordinate state plans across child welfare and juvenile justice and other allied agencies.

---

15 This process should require the inclusion of an educational component. The original Title V planning requirement under the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) was a good example.
Federal policy must be grounded in, endorse and expand best practices. Funding for and long-term support of research and evaluation can ensure that emerging practices are perfected, proven strategies are replicable and results are predictable. The discontinuation of funding for programs proven to be ineffective is important so that limited resources can be redirected.

Recommended Policy Actions:

- Require the development and funding of a research agenda focused on crossover youth and their families.
- Require that programs serving crossover youth are evaluated and findings are disseminated broadly. Provide funding for this mandate.
- Mandate the development of cost-benefit analyses by federal agencies of services and programs for crossover youth.
- Include funding for program evaluation in program grants.
- Mandate and support longitudinal studies.16
- Require that research results are integrated into federal policy development.

State Role: (Governor, State Legislature, Tribal Governments, Courts, State Agencies)

The state role complements the federal role. Both as a sponsor and a consumer of research and evaluation, state and tribal entities are important in advancing research and evaluation. As incubators of emerging practices, states and tribal governments can indicate a preference for research to support and extend lessons learned from interventions. State and tribal mandates for services should include funds for collection and analysis of program data.

Recommended Policy Actions:

- All items listed for federal level
- Require and fund research agendas in partnership with universities and researchers to answer questions related to service delivery to crossover youth and their families.
- Ensure that research findings are aligned with funding opportunities.
Local Role: (County Manager/Board, Mayor, City Council, Educational Service Agencies, School Superintendents/Boards)

Local entities may have fewer resources for research than federal and state partners, but they can often respond more quickly and flexibly in initiating smaller studies to meet locally identified needs and incorporating research findings into practice models. Innovative and specialized research and evaluation activities can lead to an expanded knowledge base and improve specialized programming.

Recommended Policy Actions:

• Require that data is collected and that agencies participate in research.
• Require the alignment of research findings with funding opportunities and program development.

Court and Agency Role: (CW and JJ agencies, Courts, Law Enforcement, Education, Behavioral Health and Substance Abuse Services)

At the practice level, policies must be explicit that knowledge building is both a function and a responsibility. Research must be linked to outcomes, and knowing how and why work is done is critical.

Recommended Policy Actions:

• Identify a research agenda for crossover youth and families.
• Create an infrastructure to support research or collaborate on research on crossover youth.
• Actively engage in and sponsor research and evaluations to better understand strategies and programs that are effective with crossover youth.
• Create research protocols and Institutional Review Board processes to facilitate and streamline approvals for research.
• Capture results of program effects and work proactively to contribute to emerging practices with crossover youth and their families.
• Modify practice models based on research results.
• Remove confidentiality barriers to sharing court and school records.
### Policy Guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Development and Support of Strategic Partnerships</th>
<th>2. Sharing of Information, Data and Outcomes</th>
<th>3. Family and Youth Engagement in System design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amend the Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDPA) and the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA) to further require cross-agency collaboration at the federal, state and local levels focused on improving outcomes for crossover youth. Amend the CAPTA and JJDPA to require that state plans address crossover youth issues. Direct current federal interagency structures to support cross-agency/cross-program collaboration to achieve better outcomes for crossover youth. Direct cross-agency action to support state and local targeting of delivery of services to crossover youth including demonstration grants, technical assistance and training grants.</td>
<td>Amend the JJDPA to encourage joint planning and cross-systems collaboration. Enforce the CAPTA requirements to gather statistics on youth who cross over from child welfare to juvenile justice. Mandate data sharing among child welfare juvenile justice and education systems through legislative reauthorization of CAPTA, JJDPA, the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Require review and elimination of federal barriers to data access consistent with privacy policies that protect use, maintenance, disclosure and, ultimately, expungement of data. Revise Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information Systems (SACWIS) requirements to facilitate virtual sharing across technological platforms, with an exemption if the data on crossover youth and youth at risk of crossing over is available through the state’s juvenile justice information system. Fund data sharing mandates, including development, training and change management costs. Mandate statistics about crossover youth to be part of states’ self-assessment in the CFSR during the reauthorization of the Adoption and Safe Families Act (ASFA).</td>
<td>Require the inclusion of crossover youth and families during the Child and Family Service Review (CFSR) process. Issue Proclamations that promote the value of family and youth involvement in policy and practice issues. Require the creation of an inter-agency Parent and Youth Council focused exclusively on crossover youth issues. Add family and youth representatives to current interagency structures/councils. Require meaningful parent and youth impact assessments and statements for legislative and regulatory proposals. Amend CAPTA and JJDPA to require family and youth participation in service planning and court proceedings at all decisions points along the case continuum. Require a review of funding and grant programs to create a mechanism to financially support youth and family participation at federal, state and local levels.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Recommended Policy Actions for Federal Policy Makers

### 4. Integrated and Coordinated Financing Strategies

- Require the funding of joint federal initiatives, including demonstration projects and training and technical assistance initiatives, to support the crossover population.
- Expand IV-B funding to create an additional allocation to prevent the crossover of youth from child welfare to juvenile justice.
- Require the development of financing mechanisms that allow reinvestment of savings from unused residential care days in either child welfare or juvenile justice due to the prevention of placement or reduced lengths of stay.
- Direct an examination and elimination of federal barriers, including categorical funding restrictions to training administrators, providers and key stakeholders across systems.
- Extend full, enhanced IV-E training reimbursement for staff providing services targeted at crossover youth, whether private or public employees.
- Provide fiscal incentives to states to reduce the rate of youth crossing over between the child welfare and juvenile justice systems including the development of national outcomes measures and standards to track state performance.
- Extend Medicaid eligibility to all crossover youth while in the juvenile justice system.
- Expand funding through Title V of the JJDPA to support collaborative efforts designed to prevent children and youth from crossing over.
- Extend NCLB fiscal support to youth who have dropped out of school and are obtaining a GED.
- Revise and expand current Title IV-E eligibility standards so all children and youth placed in foster care are categorically eligible for federal IV-E funding and extend this categorical eligibility to all youth who cross over to juvenile justice.

### 5. Jointly Developed Practice Models

- Fund cross-agency planning and implementation of a practice model aimed at addressing crossover youth issues.
- Require that other systems with a responsibility to serve crossover youth participate in the development and implementation of the practice model, including education, behavioral health and substance abuse treatment.
- Require technical assistance resource centers supported by the Department of Justice and the Department of Health and Human Services to collaborative on providing technical assistance on crossover youth.
- Require training for the workforce on a youth development model of practice designed to serve crossover youth.
- Fund national and regional “best practice” convenings.
- Request GAO studies to identify emerging practices, barriers and opportunities.

### 6. Investment in Research and Evaluation

- Require the development and funding of a research agenda focused on crossover youth and their families.
- Require that programs serving crossover youth are evaluated and findings are disseminated broadly. Provide funding for this mandate.
- Mandate the development of cost-benefit analyses by federal agencies of services and programs for crossover youth.
- Include funding for program evaluation in program grants.
- Mandate and support longitudinal studies.
- Require that research results are integrated into federal policy development.
### Recommended Policy Actions for State/Tribal Policy Makers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establish interagency structures to support cross-agency/cross-program collaboration.</td>
<td>Direct executive agencies to share data about crossover youth and develop shared or integrated information technology (IT) systems.</td>
<td>Require the inclusion of crossover youth and families during the Child and Family Service Review process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require agencies to provide integrated reporting on crossover youth.</td>
<td>Direct a review and elimination of agency administrative barriers to sharing data, consistent with appropriate privacy policies.</td>
<td>Issue Proclamations that promote the value of family and youth involvement in policy and practice issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require agencies to plan, coordinate and monitor the delivery of integrated services along the full continuum of care.</td>
<td>Direct a review and elimination of barriers created by state statute and regulation, consistent with appropriate privacy policies.</td>
<td>Require the creation of an inter-agency Parent and Youth Council focused exclusively on crossover youth issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require that the programs, policies and budgets of the agencies are coordinated to ensure the effective, efficient, and comprehensive delivery of services.</td>
<td>Require the collection, reporting, and monitoring of crossover statistics.</td>
<td>Add family and youth representatives to current interagency structures/councils.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Require the production, reporting, and monitoring of measures of repeat maltreatment and rates of adolescent maltreatment.</td>
<td>Require meaningful parent and youth impact assessments and statements for legislative and regulatory proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct a review of all possible funding options for shared or integrated IT systems, including pooled or blended agency funding.</td>
<td>Consistent with the recommendation for federal amendments to the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA) and the Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDPA), require family and youth participation in service planning and court proceedings at all decision points along the case continuum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Require that crossover youth be included in the building of state National youth in Transition Database (NYTD) tracking systems.</td>
<td>Require a review of funding and grant programs to create a mechanism to financially support youth and family participation at the state and local levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modify judicial “bench books”, which provide guidance to judges, to include information for judges about the sharing and utilization of child welfare, juvenile justice and education records in developing joint case planning, management and service delivery.</td>
<td>Establish or strengthen parent and youth legislative advisory councils, and ensure representation from the crossover population, to provide recommendations and review legislative and budget proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Establish or strengthen parent and youth boards, and ensure representation from the crossover population, to advise the Governor at regular intervals on family and youth policy and budget development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish or strengthen parent and youth advisory committees to the child-serving agencies, and ensure representation from the crossover population. Require that agencies provide leadership opportunities for parents and youth within agency workgroups and committees that allow them to encourage and direct the development of agency problems and policies. Require that all programs and policies become youth and family centered, focused on the development of supports that meet the needs identified by families and youth. Create an ombudsman function to include a focus on crossover youth issues.</td>
<td>Direct agencies to develop coordinated methods of funding to support services either at the micro level (e.g. a child’s service plan) or at the macro level (across agencies). Direct agencies to review and establish funding flexibility across programs, agencies, and categorical funding streams including decategorization, pooling and braiding resources. Direct the alignment of funding to support programs aimed at crossover youth and their families. Mandate the development of joint/shared outcomes and accountability measures related to these funding strategies. Require program planning and development aimed at crossover youth. Provide match money for systems support.</td>
<td>Require that agencies adopt and implement a written practice model that addresses crossover issues. Require that agencies’ practice models are developed with key partners at the table, including families and youth. Support and provide training for judges and court personnel, legislators, school officials and agency staff on the agency’s practice model. Embed elements of a practice model in Executive Orders. Require from jurisdictions an integrated local planning process and a written plan for crossover youth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Recommended Policy Actions for Local Policy Makers

### 1. Development of Support of Strategic Partnerships

- Establish or identify existing organizational, governance, and decision-making structures to support cross-agency/cross-program collaboration and joint assessments of resource and service needs. Examples include joint planning committees and service delivery teams.

### 2. Sharing of Information, Data and Outcomes

- Direct agencies and contractors to share information.
- Provide local match for information technology (IT) systems.
- Identify all funding options for shared or integrated IT systems including requiring agencies to share or blend funding.
- Engage law enforcement and school superintendents/boards in information sharing including research and statistics.

### 3. Family and Youth Engagement in System Design

- Require the inclusion of crossover youth and families during the Child and Family Service Review process.
- Issue Proclamations that promote the value of family and youth involvement in policy and practice issues.
- Require the creation of an inter-agency Parent and Youth Council focused exclusively on crossover youth issues.
- Add family and youth representatives to current interagency structures/councils.
- Require meaningful parent and youth impact assessments and statements for legislative and regulatory proposals.

Consistent with the recommendation for federal amendments to the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA) and the Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDPA), require family and youth participation in service planning and court proceedings at all decision points along the continuum.

- Require a review of funding and grant programs to create a mechanism to financially support youth and family participation at the state and local levels.
- Establish or strengthen parent and youth legislative advisory councils, and ensure representation from the crossover population, to provide recommendations and review legislative and budget proposals.
- Establish or strengthen parent and youth boards, and ensure representation from the crossover population, to advise local policy makers at regular intervals on family and youth policy and budget development.
- Establish or strengthen parent and youth advisory committees to the child-serving agencies, and ensure representation from the crossover population.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Guide</th>
<th>Recommended Policy Actions for Local Policy Makers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Require that agencies provide leadership opportunities for parents and youth within agency workgroups and committees that allow them to encourage and direct the development of agency programs and policies. Require that all programs and policies become youth and family centered, focused on the development of supports that meet the needs identified by families and youth. Create an ombudsman function to include a focus on crossover youth issues.</td>
<td>Direct budgeting across programmatic silos (cross-program budgeting). Define desired local outcomes for crossover population and track these over time as they relate to cross-program budgeting. Require local planning for serving crossover youth to include: -Current expenditures to serve crossover youth and their families. -Current expenditures to prevention crossover placements. -Shorten lengths of placements when they occur and promote a successful return to family, education/vocation and community. -Develop strategies to redirect current expenditures to produce better and more timely outcomes, where appropriate. -Identify strategies to recoup savings and areas for reinvestment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-locate staff and programs.</td>
<td>Develop system indicators of prior child welfare or juvenile justice involvement for youth entering either system starting at the point of referral, arrest or detention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross train across all allied agencies, including staff, managers, and judges.</td>
<td>Develop protocols and MOU’s governing how data are shared, stored, re-disclosed and expunged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish or identify existing structures to support cross-program collaboration for identification of crossover youth, service delivery (e.g. multi-disciplinary service teams) and case planning (e.g., court-program collaboration).</td>
<td>Use court orders when necessary to mandate records sharing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinated cross-agency development and use of joint youth and family assessments.</td>
<td>Develop and track outcome measures and support ongoing information quality assessment programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court order joint recommendations from child welfare and juvenile justice.</td>
<td>Track the incidence and prevalence of maltreatment, by age and over time (risk population for crossing over).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop hiring guidelines that require youth development expertise for staff positions working with adolescents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative with university partners to embed youth development theory, policy and practice in graduate and undergraduate curricula.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop memoranda of understanding (MOU’s) between agencies to eliminate barriers and foster closer working relationships.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a joint reinvestment strategy with all stakeholders, including families and youth.</td>
<td>Require the specification of a discrete practice agenda for crossover youth in the agency’s practice model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-locate staff, equipment, etc. to strengthen cross-program support of work with crossover youth and their families.</td>
<td>Align hiring practices and staff development efforts with the model of practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantify the downstream costs of crossover youth and potential savings.</td>
<td>Communicate the practice model to all staff, stakeholders, youth and families served.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund and create opportunities for joint training.</td>
<td>Collaborate with university partners to embed elements of the practice model in graduate and undergraduate curricula.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinate state plans across child welfare and juvenile justice and other allied agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support interdisciplinary training of elements of the practice model across allied agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop and track outcome measures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Building Multisystem Approaches in Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice was commissioned by Casey Family Programs, the American Public Human Services Association, and the Center for Juvenile Justice Reform to inform the discussion at the Wingspread Conference. This original piece of research by Drs. Denise Herz of the School of Criminal Justice and Criminalistics at California State University – Los Angeles, and Joseph Ryan of the School of Social Work at University of Illinois – Urbana-Champaign was completed prior to the Conference and distributed to all attendees in advance of their participation at Wingspread. Drs. Herz and Ryan presented the paper on the first day of the Conference and thus set the stage for all further dialogue throughout the remainder of three days. The findings of Drs. Herz and Ryan presented in this report provide a powerful impetus to address head-on the struggles of children and youth known to both the child welfare and juvenile justice systems and to find ways to better integrate these and other youth serving systems.
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Introduction: Building Multisystem Approaches in Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice

There has been much focus on and attention around the greater use of coordinated and collaborative efforts within this country’s child, youth, and family serving systems of care. This trend is predicated in part on a growing body of research finding that the clients being served by these various systems are known across their respective domains – at times concurrently and at other times along a developmental arc. This is reflected, for example, in research that has examined and confirmed the link between child maltreatment and later delinquency, negative child and youth outcomes associated with institutional placements in the child welfare and juvenile justice systems, and the impact of the inadequate provision of behavioral health and educational services for children and youth in care.

The response to these issues has been the increased use of legislative and executive mandates to incorporate multisystem approaches. These have included the use of children’s cabinets, directives to more fully explore information sharing, blended funding schemes, and new and more efficient and effective service delivery systems. This trend has also surfaced in the reauthorizations of the federal Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act and the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act in direction to those federal agencies to better support multisystem efforts within their constituencies. The inclusion of “well-being” as a federal outcome of interest in the Child and Family Service Reviews has also pushed jurisdictions toward collaborative efforts.

The level of activity in “the field” across the juvenile justice, child welfare, health, behavioral health, and education systems designed to meet these mandates has been frenetic over the past several years. Unfortunately, it is taking place in unchartered waters with little informed guidance or coordinated effort. The opportunity exists, however, to create a better planned and more coherent multisystem body of work. In the fall of 2007, Casey Family Programs (CFP), American Public Human Services Association (APHSA), and Georgetown University’s Public Policy Institute through its Center for Juvenile Justice Reform (CJJR) partnered to form an initiative focused on multisystem approaches in child welfare and juvenile justice.

The Research & Data Report

In an effort to guide this process, APHSA, CFP and the CJJR commissioned the production of this research and data report on the prevalence of the crossover in the population known to the systems of care and the key areas of exploration to be the focus of the convening. The purpose of the report is to summarize existing research on the pathways that children follow from the child welfare into the juvenile justice system and the increased probabilities of engaging in delinquent behavior after experiencing abuse and/or neglect (Chapter 1); summarize existing research on the characteristics of these children and how they are handled in the juvenile justice system (Chapter 2); identify the jurisdictions that have done the best job of quantifying the number of youth known to both systems (Chapter 3); contribute to the field of knowledge in this area by conducting a nationwide survey of state child welfare and juvenile justice agencies (Chapter 4), and; provide a brief synthesis of the
Information contained in the report, one that will help to facilitate a more in depth exploration of its implications for policy development at the federal, state, and local levels (Chapter 5).

**Report Terminology & Definitions**

One of the most pressing problems in this area is the lack of clear terminology and definitions to consistently reference youth who become involved in both child welfare and delinquency. To avoid confusion, key terms used throughout this report are defined below.

Child welfare and the dependency system are used interchangeably to reference the overall system of handling abused/neglected children. Similarly, dependent youth are youth who are currently under the care and custody of the dependency court due to sustained allegations of child abuse and/or neglect. Since child welfare agency names vary widely by state, this report uses “child protective services” (CPS) to reference the child welfare agency that provides social services to an abused/neglected youth.

The juvenile justice system and juvenile court are used to denote involvement in the delinquency court system. Delinquent youth, then, are youth who are currently under the care and custody of the delinquency court due to sustained charges of delinquency. Probation departments are typically county-based agencies (with state oversight) that are responsible for the supervision of delinquent youth. The average youth on probation is supervised in the community rather than in an out-of-home placement; however, probation departments in many states also use group homes (i.e., congregate care) and other residential treatment center placements and a few probation departments also operate correctional institutions. Institutional corrections agencies are often state-based agencies responsible for correctional placements of delinquent youth who have longer criminal histories and/or are adjudicated for more serious crimes.

This report primarily uses the phrase “crossover youth” to refer to youth who penetrate both the child welfare and juvenile justice systems. These youth are also commonly referred to as dual jurisdiction youth or dually-involved youth (Halemba, Siegel, Lord, & Zawacki, 2004). A youth may become a crossover youth in one of three primary ways. The most frequent pathway occurs when a youth enters the child welfare system and later commits a crime while under the care and custody of child protective services. A second pathway involves a youth with prior, but not current, contact in child welfare who commits a crime and enters the delinquency system. A third possible pathway occurs when a youth with no prior child welfare system contact enters the delinquency system and probation refers the case to child protective services for further investigation of abuse/neglect. Although this report does not exclude any pathways, most references to crossover youth in the report are related to the first pathway.
The Need for Collaboration

The issues of “crossover” youth and the negative trajectory of children who experience maltreatment and abuse highlight the need for systems to work together. Juvenile justice and child welfare professionals have long recognized the challenges shared by the two systems, but there is a growing need to work collaboratively to achieve the shared goal of improving the outcomes for children and youth in the care and custody of county and state agencies. The bar has been raised by leaders in the child-serving systems from simply reducing recidivism or establishing safety, to ensuring: the safe and appropriate return or maintenance of youth in their families and homes; academic attainment; behavioral and physical health; and preparation of youth for a successful future. The increasing pressure of these shared but difficult goals has forced the acceleration from dialog to engagement, from discussion to movement, from planning to action. This paper and the Wingspread conference provide the foundation upon which to build this commitment to a multisystem approach to achieving the goal of well-being for children and youth through policy and practice leadership.
Chapter 1: The Relationship between Maltreatment and Delinquency

At least forty years of scholarship seeks to understand the association between child maltreatment and juvenile delinquency. The findings from this literature are fairly consistent with regard to the overall risk. That is, victims of physical abuse and/or neglect are at an increased risk of engaging in delinquency (Bolton, Reich, & Gutierres, 1977; Alfaro, 1981; Widom, 1989; Zingraff, Leiter, Myers & Johnsen, 1993; Kelley, Thornberry & Smith, 1997; Stewart, Dennison & Waterson, 2002; Widom & Maxfield, 1996; Ryan & Testa, 2005; see also Wiig, Widom, & Tuell, 2002; and Petro, 2006 for reviews of this literature). The purpose of this chapter is to review and summarize the relevant literature and to identify gaps in the knowledge base. Although we review the broader maltreatment–delinquency literature, particular attention is focused on studies of crossover youth in child welfare.

Maltreatment as a Risk Factor for Delinquency

An estimated 2.2 million arrests were made of persons under 18 years of age in 2004. Approximately 91,000 of these arrests were associated with a violent crime (e.g. murder, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault). Approximately 450,000 of these arrests were associated with a property crime (Snyder, 2006). Although these figures represent a continued decline in juvenile offending, and in particular violent offending, delinquency continues to be a major social problem. This is especially true for victims of child abuse and/or neglect, as these children and adolescents are at an increased risk of engaging in juvenile offending, and even subsequent adult offending. In a seminal study of maltreatment and delinquency, Widom (1989) utilized matched cohorts and estimated that early child abuse and/or neglect increased the risk of any arrest as a juvenile by 55% and increased the risk of a violent crime arrest as a juvenile by 96%. Similar estimates are found in more recent studies. For example, Ryan and Testa (2005) analyzed data from the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (ICJIA), the Department of Children and Family Services, and the Cook County Juvenile Court to compare the delinquency rates for maltreated and non-maltreated youth. The delinquency rates are calculated by dividing the number of delinquency petitions in a given year by the eligible population (ages 10-16) in that same year. Two trend lines were generated, one for youth in the general population, and one for youth formally involved (e.g. substantiated report of maltreatment) with the child welfare system. On average, the delinquency rates for adolescents involved with the child welfare system were approximately 47% greater than their non-maltreated counterparts (see Figure 1) (Ryan & Testa, 2005).

The trend for both groups indicates a steady decline between 1995 and 2000. It appears the factors that influence delinquency in the general population also influence the likelihood of delinquency for victims of maltreatment. The delinquency petition rates are consistently higher for DCFS youth. These differences are greatest in 1998 and 1999 when the rate associated with DCFS youth is 56% (4,330 vs. 2,780) and 57% (3,739 vs. 2,389) greater than the rate associated with non-DCFS youth. Mersky and Reynolds (2007), also using data from Illinois as part of the Chicago Longitudinal Study report that maltreatment is associated with a 51% increase in the likelihood of being adjudicated for a violent offense.
It is important to note that the differences in these estimates of delinquency cannot solely be attributed to the experiences of abuse and/or neglect. There are many other critical covariates that are not considered – such as family structure, economic status, and neighborhood characteristics, to name only a few. This raises an important question: what is it about maltreatment or the states’ response to maltreatment that seems to increase the risk of delinquency for youth involved with child protection? Unfortunately, little is known about specific factors or mechanisms that increase or decrease the risk of crossover for youth in the child welfare system. Yet some studies exist – focusing largely on placement, placement instability, and social bonds (Jonson-Reid & Barth, 2000a; English, Widom & Branford, 2000; Ryan & Testa, 2005, Ryan, Testa & Zhai, 2008).

**Child Welfare Placements and Crossing Over into Delinquency**

For a variety of reasons, placement and placement instability in the child welfare system are the most frequently investigated risk factors associated with crossover youth. Substitute care settings (e.g. foster care, group homes) may protect children from continued maltreatment and the environmental conditions (e.g. family dysfunction, neighborhood crime) associated with delinquency. It is possible, however, that children in substitute care settings may be unintentionally exposed to other factors known to increase involvement with the juvenile justice system (e.g. negative peer groups, frequent disruptions of placement). In fact, several large studies report that children in substitute care settings are at an increased risk (approximately two times more likely) for engaging in delinquency as compared with children receiving in home services. This finding holds across gender, racial, and ethnic groups (English, Widom & Branford, 2000; Ryan & Testa, 2005; Doyle, in press).

Part of the problem with substitute care settings is the frequent disruptions, either resulting from youth running away or from foster parents’ inability to tolerate the emotional and behavioral problems of children in care (Zinn, 2006). Research clearly documents instability in the foster care system, and notes the association between such instability and problems in other child developmental
domains. A study of foster care in Illinois reports that, of all children in care on June 30, 1998, approximately 38% had experienced at least four different placements (Hartnett, Falconnier, Leathers & Testa, 1999). This finding is disconcerting, as instability is associated with a wide variety of negative outcomes including mental health problems, weak attachments, feelings of insecurity, overall dissatisfaction with the foster care system, and juvenile delinquency (Early, Mooney & Poertner, 2002; Fanshel, Finch & Grundy, 1990; Goldstein, Freud & Solnit, 1973; Lieberman, 1987; Van der Kolk, 1987; Jonson-Reid & Barth, 2000a; Jonson-Reid & Barth, 2000b; Jonson-Reid & Barth, 2003; Festinger, 1983; Kurtz, Gaudin, Howing & Wodarski, 1993; Redding, Fried & Brittner, 2000). For example, adolescent males with multiple child welfare placements were more likely to enter the juvenile justice system. The odds of delinquency were 1.54 times greater for males with three placements, and 2.13 times greater for males with four or more placements as compared with males with only one placement (Ryan & Testa, 2005).

Yet not all placements appear to be equal. That is, some placements within the child welfare system may be more problematic than others. Group homes, for example, have long been considered problematic in child welfare. A recent review entitled Institutions vs. Foster Homes: the Empirical Base for a Century of Action indicates that there is virtually no evidence to support the use of group care in child welfare (Barth, 2002). Group homes are described as unsafe, unable to support healthy development, unstable, and expensive. Moreover, children in group care settings report seeing family members less often as compared with children in kinship care, and are less likely to experience reunification with biological caregivers; this is especially true for children aged 6 to 12 (Barth, 2002; Wulczyn, Hilsop, & Goerge, 2001). Within the child welfare system, approximately 11% of all substitute care placements are associated with a group home (CA RADD, 2001). Yet such placements are expensive, oftentimes costing between six and ten times as much as placement in a foster family home (Barth, 2002). In 2000 for example, 43% of all substitute care dollars in the State of California were associated with group home placements (CA RADD, 2001). As justification for the increased costs, the needs of group home youth are oftentimes far more complex and demanding than youth in foster family settings. Yet problems may still emerge even in such structured settings. Specific to crossover youth, an increased risk of delinquency may result from the exposure to other high risk adolescents, commonly referred to as peer contagion.

Peer contagion refers to the exposure and socialization processes (e.g. social learning) that are likely to shape and support deviant attitudes and behaviors in group care settings. Dishion et al. (1999) report that peer group interventions increase problem behaviors and negative life outcomes throughout adolescence and into early adulthood. The authors argue that serving youth in congregate residential settings, and specifically the prolonged exposure to high risk peers has the unintended effect of exacerbating deviance via social relationships. The conceptualization of deviance includes, but is not limited to, smoking, school problems, aggression, substance abuse, and delinquency (Lee, 2007).

So what do we know with regard to group homes and crossover youth? Using administrative records from Los Angeles County, Ryan, Marshall, Herz, and Hernandez (2008) report that the relative risk of delinquency is approximately two and one half times greater for adolescents with at least one group home placement as compared to similar youth in other foster care settings. Matching arrest dates with placement dates, the authors of the Los Angeles study also identified the placement location at the time of arrest. That is, at what point are youth arrested with regard to placement
status? Are adolescents in the child welfare system arrested during their stay in the group home or subsequent to their release? Of these 20,309 youth in the sample, 2,106 adolescents were associated with at least one arrest, and 1,671 (79%) of these youth experienced their first arrest in a substitute care placement setting (see Figure 2). Of the 1,671 adolescents arrested in placement, 675 (40%) of the arrests occurred while the youth was placed in a group home. As only about 20% of the Los Angeles sample ever experienced a group home placement (this percentage is significantly less for younger children in the child welfare system), and as such placements are relatively short in duration (as compared to the time spent in foster care), the estimate of 40% is troubling.

In summary, substitute care arrangements in the child welfare system seem to be associated with an increased risk of delinquency. This is true when comparing youth in foster care with youth who remain in the home. Yet, within the out-of-home care system, group homes seem to have the largest effect with regard to crossing over.

![Figure 2: Location of Youth at Time of Arrest](image)

### Racial Disparities in Child Welfare and Crossing Over into Delinquency

It is critical to note in any discussion of crossover youth that race continues to be an important predictor of movement between child welfare and juvenile justice. This is especially true for African American youth. In the United States, African Americans comprise approximately 15% of the population, yet African American youth account for 25% of child protection investigations, 30% of substantiated investigations, and 36% of placement cases (entries into out-of-home care). On average, the disproportionality index for African American children in child welfare is 2.26, which means that they are overrepresented in foster care at a rate of more than twice their proportion in the U.S. child population. Similar findings are found within the juvenile justice literature. African American youth are more likely to be arrested, more likely to be placed in detention, and less likely to receive mental health services (Lieber & Fox, 2005; Rawal, Romansky, Jenuwine & Lyons, 2004). The Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (2005) estimates that African American youth are arrested at a rate that is nearly five times the rate at which white youth are arrested. The problem of
overrepresentation is not limited to a singular county. Of the 42 counties studied in Illinois, 35 (83%) report overrepresentation of African Americans at the point of arrest. The findings in Illinois are similar to those at the national level.

The issue of race is critical because it appears that the problem of crossover youth is a significant contributor to the overrepresentation of African American youth in the juvenile justice system (also referred to as disproportionate minority contact or DMC). Because there is already overrepresentation in the child welfare system, even if child welfare was responsible for referring a representative sample to the juvenile justice system, such referrals would contribute greatly to DMC. Yet the population moving from child welfare to juvenile justice is not representative of adolescents in placement. African Americans in the child welfare system are approximately two times more likely than white adolescents in the child welfare system to experience at least one arrest (Ryan & Testa, 2005). This increased risk is clearly evident when looking at population percentages. For example, in Los Angeles County, African Americans comprise approximately 14% of the general population, 30% of the overall child welfare population, 41% of foster care placements, and 54% of population that moves from child welfare to juvenile justice. Overall, open child welfare cases account for 7% of all new arrests each year, but account for 14% of all African Americans entering the juvenile justice system (Ryan, Herz, Hernandez, & Marshall, 2007). Thus, by understanding and addressing the mechanisms that contribute to crossover, the overrepresentation of African American youth in the juvenile justice system should decrease.

**Figure 3: Overrepresentation of Crossover Youth in Los Angeles County**

![Figure 3: Overrepresentation of Crossover Youth in Los Angeles County](image)

The age of the child in the child protection system, and more specifically the age at time of maltreatment have emerged in the literature as interesting and important findings over the last decade. Scholars in this area approach the study of adolescent maltreatment and delinquency from a life course perspective. The life course perspective, in contrast with the developmental psychopathology approach, suggests that adolescent maltreatment may have a larger effect on delinquency because the
two events are more proximal (Sampson & Laub, 2001). The empirical evidence seems to support this hypothesis. Researchers associated with the Rochester Youth Development Study have repeatedly demonstrated that the timing of maltreatment is important in understanding the etiology of juvenile delinquency. The authors conclude that adolescent limited and persistent maltreatment lead to a variety of negative outcomes through early adulthood, including drug use, teen pregnancy, and juvenile delinquency (Smith, Ireland, & Thornberry, 2005; Ireland, Smith, & Thornberry, 2002; Thornberry, Ireland, & Smith, 2001). In short, maltreatment that begins and ends in early childhood does not appear to have any significant impact on a wide range of adolescent outcomes including delinquency. In contrast, maltreatment experienced in adolescence increases a wide variety of adjustment problems (Thornberry, Ireland, & Smith, 2001).

Despite the increased likelihood of delinquency associated with males, the female delinquency population is growing. In fact, females represent the fastest growing segment of the juvenile justice population, their arrests having increased by 72% since 1983 as compared to 30% for males under 18 years of age (Snyder, 2002).

In addition to race and age of maltreatment, the role of gender as a key variable for crossover youth is consistently identified. Similar to the broader delinquency literature, males are far more likely to engage in delinquency, and thus, enter the juvenile justice system (Snyder, 2006). This finding also appears within delinquency studies in child welfare settings. In a study following two birth cohorts through child welfare and juvenile justice for eighteen years, 14% of males experienced at least one delinquency petition compared with only 4% of females (Ryan & Testa, 2005). Despite the increased likelihood of delinquency associated with males, the female delinquency population is growing. In fact, females represent the fastest growing segment of the juvenile justice population, their arrests having increased by 72% since 1983 as compared to 30% for males under 18 years of age (Snyder, 2002). Females are also more likely to be held for technical violations and status offenses as compared to males in the juvenile justice system (Sickmund, 2004). Once in the juvenile justice system, female offenders are more likely to be identified with mental health problems, such as PTSD, suicidal behavior, dissociative disorder, and borderline personality disorder (Cauffman, Feldman, Waterman & Steiner, 1998). Gender-specific findings within the maltreatment – delinquency literature are scant, but there is some evidence to suggest that the child welfare system contributes disproportionately to females in the juvenile justice system. In Los Angeles County, 37% of crossover youth are female as compared to 24% of first time female offenders entering the juvenile justice system from other referral sources (Ryan, Herz, Hernandez, & Marshall, 2007). It is clear that males are at the greatest risk of crossing over, but the disparity between females entering juvenile justice via child welfare versus other referral avenues is important to note.
Social Bonds as a Protective Factor against Crossing Over into Delinquency

Our review of the literature thus far, and the maltreatment – delinquency literature in general, has consisted largely of identifying risk factors to help explain the movement from child welfare to juvenile justice. Yet there exists a smaller literature on potential protective factors. This work focuses on the role of social bonds. Healthy development is dependent upon parents and other socializing agents making consistent investments in the care, education, and supervision of children. Such investments help instill a sense of attachment, commitment, and obligation that tie children to family and conventional role models. Social control theorists posit that these investments and social bonds prevent children from engaging in delinquency. Difficulties arise when children experience low levels of investment and weak social bonds. When confronted with opportunities to engage in nonconforming or undesirable behaviors, children with extensive and strong social bonds have a greater stake in conformity, and are less likely to engage in delinquent behavior that might jeopardize those relationships (Furstenberg & Hughes, 1995; Hirschi, 1969). Attachment and commitment represent two key components of the social bond theory, and seem to play an important role in preventing crossover.

Healthy development is dependent upon parents and other socializing agents making consistent investments in the care, education, and supervision of children.

Child welfare practitioners and scholars assert that attachment is important because it is the foundation for the provision of quality care, and is an important predictor of healthy psychological development (Vuchinich et al., 2002; Kelly & McSherry, 2002; and Committee on Early Childhood, Adoption, and Dependent Care, 2000). The establishment of positive relationships between the foster child and the foster care provider can minimize a child’s emotional distress and the negative effects on their development from temporary separation from their parents. Moreover, attachment can provide a safe context in which new relational skills can be developed (Haight, Kagle, & Black, 2003). The literature describing the importance of attachment is consistent. Yet, the literature focusing on the strengths of social bonds achieved within the foster home is somewhat inconsistent.

In a study of young adults leaving the foster care system in Wisconsin, Courtney, Piliavin, Grogan-Kaylor, and Nesmith (2001) reported that 75% of all youth felt “somewhat close” or “close” to their foster caregivers. Nearly 40% of these youth also reported staying in contact with foster parents subsequent to discharge, and 20% reported receiving continued emotional support and advice with decision making from their foster parents. Despite high levels of perceived attachment, 37% reported running away from the foster home at least once, 32% reported feeling lonely, 28% felt foster parents treated their biological children better than foster children, and 34% reported being “mistreated” at least some of the time while in substitute care placement. Similarly, in a study of quality parent-child interactions, Wallace and Belcher (1997) report that approximately 18% of foster children live in “at risk” homes.
So can strong social bonds prevent crossover? In a recent longitudinal study of 278 African American males in foster care, Ryan, Testa, and Zhai (2008) investigate the impact of various aspects of attachment and commitment on subsequent offending. The authors measured two dimensions of attachment. The first measure focused on the relationship between the foster youth and the foster parent and included questions about frequency of communication and level of caring. Additional measures focused on parental monitoring and included questions about setting rules and familiarity with the youth’s peer group. The findings support the association between attachment and delinquency, but only with regard to the child-parent relationship. That is, more positive relationships between the foster youth and foster parent were associated with a decreased risk of delinquency. No significant association emerged between parental monitoring and delinquency. Regarding commitment, the authors used a variety of measures organized within education and religion to estimate the commitment – delinquency relationship. These measures included information on prior school suspensions, plans to attend college, participation in after school activities, and involvement with religious organizations. The findings support association between commitment and delinquency, but only with regard to involvement with religious organizations and prior school suspensions. Foster youth involved with religious organizations (whether for religious service or other community event) were less likely to experience a delinquency petition. In contrast, foster children that were suspended from school were more likely to engage in delinquent behavior.

Summary

This much is known, victims of child abuse and/or neglect are at an increased risk of juvenile delinquency. And although with less empirical support, it also appears that once arrested, dependent youth experience more severe sanctions and are pushed deeper into the juvenile justice system. From the literature, placement (in particular, group placements), placement instability, the timing of maltreatment, and lack of social bonds are important predictors for the emergence of delinquency within the child welfare system. Moreover, similar to the broader delinquency literature, race continues to be a significant factor related to crossing from child welfare into delinquency.

Despite decades of major scholarly contributions, much remains unknown about crossover youth. How can child welfare best prevent contact with juvenile justice? Once arrests occur, which system is best equipped to respond to the complex needs of crossover youth? Should individual cases be served under a dual jurisdiction model? In addition to arrests, recidivism, and judicial dispositions, what other areas should be considered in the evaluation of innovative crossover initiatives. Child welfare systems are clearly moving beyond the traditional outcome areas of safety and permanence and focusing considerable efforts on promoting child well-being. Areas of greatest interest seem to be academic achievement, mental health, and social adjustment.

Academic achievement and school engagement are associated with a wide variety of important outcomes, including self esteem, high school graduation, college enrollment, career opportunities, job performance ratings, future earnings, and delinquency and crime (Fredricks, Blumenfeld & Paris, 2004; Teasley & Lee, 2006; Yonezato, 1992; Redd, Cochran, Hair & Moore, 2002). The interest in academics is reflected not only in the scientific literature, but also in the enactment of recent legislation. For example, California AB 490 imposes a variety of new duties and rights related to the education of abused and neglected children in care (e.g., immediate school enrollment, ensuring
school stability during placement disruptions). Similar legislation can be found in Arkansas (House bill 1710, Act 1255) and Florida (FL ST s 39.0016). Regarding mental health and social adjustment, adolescents with mental health problems in the child welfare system spend more time in foster care, are more likely to bounce between multiple foster homes, and are less likely to experience reunification relative to adolescents without such problems (Horwitz, Simms & Farrington, 1994; Newton, Litrownik & Landsverk, 2000; Landsverk, Davis, Ganger, Newton & Johnson, 1996). The risk of delinquency is perhaps further increased when adequate and timely services are not provided. Cuellar, Markowitz and Libby (2004) studied the effects of mental health services for foster children in Colorado. The authors conclude that the provision of targeted services delays and prevents juvenile detention.

In addition to important outcomes to measure, the crossover literature currently lacks a coherent theoretical framework for evaluating proposed initiatives. Interactional theory (Thornberry, 1987) and social network theory (Krohn, 1986) are perhaps the most appropriate frameworks for evaluating the innovative strategies focused on the movement between service systems, and the relationship between such movement and the long term well-being of dependent youth. Within the context of a child welfare system, the onset of delinquency may emerge as bonds weaken and children move between various placement settings. Whether or not adolescents continue to engage in delinquency depends in part on the association with other delinquent youth and the formation of delinquent beliefs. Once delinquent patterns emerge, they have feedback effects, further compromising one’s bond with conventional societal norms. Interactional and social network theories are well suited, because such frameworks permit one to investigate the factors that explain the three distinct phases of delinquency: onset, duration, and termination. The collection of new data informed by a relevant theoretical framework would permit one to investigate how such settings impact a wide range of developmental issues, including but not limited to, peer networks, antisocial beliefs, academic motivation, and repeat offending.
Chapter 2: The Prevalence and Characteristics of Crossover Youth

While the literature is unequivocal in its conclusion that maltreatment increases the likelihood of delinquency (see Widom & Maxfield, 2001; Wiig, Widom, & Tuell, 2003; and Petro, 2006 for reviews of this literature), it is virtually silent on the prevalence of this phenomenon. Although some research estimates 9% to 29% of dependent children engage in delinquent behavior (Smith & Thornberry, 1995; Kelley, Thornberry & Smith, 1997; Widom, 1989; Stewart, Dennison & Waterson, 2002; Zingraff, Leiter, Myers & Johnsen, 1993), Halemba, Siegel, Lord, and Zawacki (2004) examined data from Arizona’s state information system (JOLTS) and found that crossover youth represented larger proportions of the delinquency cases as penetration of the system deepened. Only 1% of informal diversion delinquency cases, for instance, were crossover youth compared to 7% of probation supervision cases and 42% of cases in a probation placement (see Halemba & Lord, 2005 for similar estimates in Ohio).

The prevalence of crossing over is difficult to estimate because crossover youth are typically subsumed in agency-specific information systems that are rarely, if ever, integrated (Herz, Krinsky, & Ryan, 2006). This problem plagues many states and counties which must dedicate additional time and resources to identify the extent of crossover youth before they can begin to address the problem (Wiig & Tuell, 2004). To include the perspective of state and county administrators in probation and child welfare in this discussion, several questions related to the prevalence were included in the nationwide survey administered as part of this report.  

The survey results reaffirm the widespread belief that very few states and jurisdictions are equipped to identify and track crossover youth in their systems. The prevalence of crossing over is difficult to estimate because crossover youth are typically subsumed in agency-specific information systems that are rarely, if ever, integrated (Herz, Krinsky, & Ryan, 2006). This problem plagues many states and counties which must dedicate additional time and resources to identify the extent of crossover youth before they can begin to address the problem (Wiig & Tuell, 2004). To include the perspective of state and county administrators in probation and child welfare in this discussion, several questions related to the prevalence were included in the nationwide survey administered as part of this report.

The survey results reaffirm the widespread belief that very few states and jurisdictions are equipped to identify and track crossover youth in their systems. The results for prevalence questions, across state and county respondents, are presented Table 2.1. The questions included in this table ask respondents whether crossover youth are documented using either an integrated information system or simply a dedicated field within child welfare or juvenile justice. Very few county or state respondents indicated the existence of an integrated information system (10% at the county level and 19% at the state level). Moreover, the likelihood of agencies receiving an integrated information system is very low (somewhere just above “very unlikely”).

---

1 Respondents for this study included a convenience sample of: state administrators for child protective services, state administrators for juvenile probation, state administrators for juvenile institutional corrections, juvenile justice specialists, county administrators for child protective services, county administrators for probation, county administrators for juvenile corrections, and juvenile court judges. Please see Appendix A for a description of the procedures used in conducting the survey and for a summary of response rates.
Table 2.1: Information Systems and Crossover Data Fields

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>State (N=74)</th>
<th></th>
<th>County (N=107)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do CPS and JP agencies currently have integrated information systems in your State/County?</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If not, what is likelihood that they will have integrated systems in next 5 years?</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If not, does CPS have data field to record delinquency involvement?</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is CPS data field completed consistently and accurately?</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If not, does probation have data field to record CPS involvement?</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is probation data field completed consistently and accurately?</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Yes=1; No or Don’t Know=0  
2 Response categories: 1=Not likely at all; 2=Very unlikely; 3=Somewhat likely; 4=Very likely; 5=Guaranteed  
NOTE: SD=Standard Deviation

The survey also included a question about a dedicated data field that – despite the lack of integrated systems– still might capture youth involved with both child welfare and juvenile justice. Approximately one third of all respondents indicated that a data field does indeed exist, yet the information is far from accurate. Child welfare respondents (29% at the county level and 4% at the state level) reported that this data field is completed “consistently and accurately.” For those responding from juvenile probation, 20% at the county level and 13% at the state level responded in the same way.

Despite the lack of integrated information systems or dedicated data fields, it is possible that counties and states document the prevalence of crossover youth via special studies or more regular reporting. More than half of survey respondents reported regularly documenting the number of crossover youth (67% county level and 60% at state level), but the majority of this documentation was done informally.

The informal nature of assessing prevalence was confirmed through follow-up phone conversations with a variety of state and county officials. Ten states were initially selected for follow-up contact from the survey database. Results collected from these respondents verified that very little effort is
dedicated to generating accurate estimates of the crossover population. Respondents explained that prevalence estimates were typically based on caseworkers reviewing case files or educated guesses by supervisors. An example response illustrates this point:

We don't have a formal way to document our crossover youth. We have a positive working relationship with Juvenile Probation. I simply contacted the Chief Juvenile Probation Manager and got a ballpark figure of who they serve and the cases we have in common. He thought about 800-850 youth on their caseload and 20-25% are also in the child welfare system. My office has many of the adolescent services and so again, I know that many of the kids we deal with are what you call crossover youth.

Both the literature and survey responses verify that prevalence estimates for crossover youth are practically non-existent. This represents a concerning gap between the desire to impact change in the handling of crossover youth and a system’s ability to actually effect change in this area. Without knowing how many crossover youth are in child welfare and juvenile justice systems, it is difficult to understand and respond to the needs of this population. To explore this issue further, the characteristics of crossover youth are considered.

**Crossover Youth Characteristics**

The lack of information available on the prevalence of crossover youth in the child welfare and juvenile justice systems has prevented a widespread exploration of crossover youth characteristics. As a result, very few studies document the characteristics and needs of crossover youth because the data are simply not available. Fortunately, the literature is not devoid of any information on crossover youth characteristics. To date, three studies have contributed to this area (Herz & Ryan, in press; Halemba, Siegel, Lord, & Zawacki, 2004; Kelley, Thornberry, & Smith, 1997). Although limited in number, these studies provide substantial insight into the demographics and background characteristics of these youth (i.e., family histories, school factors, prior involvement in the juvenile justice system, placement histories, and treatment histories), their treatment needs (i.e., mental health, substance abuse, and behavioral/social), their risk levels, and their behavior outcomes (i.e., recidivism).

The first study reviewed in this chapter, Herz and Ryan (in press) examined data from Los Angeles County, California. The Los Angeles County Juvenile Court requires that all crossover youth receive a joint assessment from probation and the Department of Children and Family Services as part of the adjudication process. Herz and Ryan were given access to these joint assessment reports and extracted a number of demographic, legal, and social characteristics from reports completed between April 1, 2004 and December 31, 2004. The unit of analysis for the study was unique individuals. In other words, the most current referral was coded for youths referred multiple times within the time frame. Earlier referrals were then captured as prior offenses. The final number of youth identified cases in this study was 581.
Halemba, Siegal, Lord, and Zawacki (2004) analyzed two types of data for four counties in Arizona (Cochise, Coconino, Maricopa, and Pima Counties). First, data were extracted from the state information system (JOLTS) for all juveniles with an active dependency, delinquency, or status referral between July 1, 2001 and June 30, 2002. This procedure yielded 60,536 youth, of which 3,689 (6%) were crossover youth. Current court history information was then used through August 2003 for all cases. Secondly, data were manually collected from 204 case files (129 from Maricopa County and 75 from Pima County). The case files were randomly selected from a list of youth who had been on probation supervision and had an active dependency record between July 1, 2004 and June 30, 2005. While the first set of data was limited largely to legal characteristics of youth, the second set of data yielded a wide range of demographic and social characteristic information. Given the type of data collected, the authors were able to compare crossover youth to delinquency-only youth.

The third study, Kelley, Thornberry, and Smith (1997) analyzed data collected as part of the Rochester Youth Development Study. This study is part of a longitudinal project under OJJDP’s Program of Research on the Causes and Correlates of Delinquency. The sample included a cohort of 1,000 youth drawn from public school students in seventh and eighth grade in spring 1988 in Rochester, New York. The participants were interviewed every six months for multiple waves of data collection. This study used seven waves of data to assess the impact of maltreatment on various outcomes. Both self-report and official data were collected to measure delinquency. Maltreatment was measured by identifying cases with substantiated records of abuse or neglect with the Monroe County Department of Social Services prior to the age of 12. Youth with maltreatment histories were then compared to youth without maltreatment histories on a number of outcomes, including delinquency, pregnancy, drug use, GPA, and mental health problems.

Although these studies directly capture information on crossover youth, the samples represent crossover youth in slightly different situations. Herz and Ryan’s (in press) population represents all crossover youth adjudicated in the delinquency court; in other words, they were not selected based on a disposition status (e.g., under probation supervision). Halemba et al.’s (2004) study is similar to Herz and Ryan’s (in press) with one important difference. Their sample only included crossover youth under probation supervision at home, in out-of-home placement, or in the custody of juvenile corrections. Finally Kelley et al.’s (1997) sample was a general population sample rather than a sample derived from the juvenile justice system. Crossover youth in this study were identified by a history of contact with child protective services combined with either an official report of delinquency or self-reported involvement with delinquency. While all three samples share common characteristics, the differences are important to note prior to reviewing and comparing the findings related to each.

Demographics

Both Herz and Ryan (in press) and Halemba et al. (2004) reported demographic profiles for crossover youth within the child welfare and juvenile justice systems. In Los Angeles, 67% of crossover offenders were male. Although males outnumbered females among crossover youth, the percentage of crossover females (33%) was noticeably higher compared to the national statistics for females entering the juvenile justice system (26%; Snyder & Sickmund, 2006). With regard to race, 63% of
crossover youth in Los Angeles County were African-American, which reflects a significant overrepresentation of African-American youth relative to the general population, child protective service referrals, and delinquency referrals. For example, African-American youth represent only 10% of the general population, 37% of referrals to child protective services, and 28% of delinquency referrals. Twenty eight percent of offenders were Latino, 8% were Caucasian, and less than one percent was of another race/ethnicity. The average age of crossover youth at the time of their current offense was 15.73 years, and the average time between entering the dependency system on a sustained petition and the current offense was 7.41 years.

Halemba et al.’s (2004) analysis of case file information for crossover youth placed on probation produced similar demographic breakdowns for gender, but slightly different findings across race/ethnicity. Sixty-nine percent of the cases were male, and 31% were female. Only 12% of cases, however, were African-American compared to 53% Caucasian, 27% Latino, and 3% Native American. The race/ethnicity differences between Los Angeles and the four counties in Arizona are quite large. Although it is difficult to assess the reason for the difference, it is likely influenced by the different demographic composition of the two areas.

Family

Crossover youth in both Los Angeles and Arizona exhibited substantial amounts of family history with criminal behavior, mental health problems, substance abuse, and domestic violence. In Los Angeles, 72% of crossover youth had a biological mother or father with history of substance abuse, 24% had a history of mental health, and 36% had a history of criminal behavior. At least 33% of these crossover youth were exposed to domestic violence, and at least 17% were born drug-exposed. The numbers were similar but a bit elevated in Arizona. Seventy-eight percent had a family history of substance abuse, 31% had a history of mental health, 55% had a parent that was incarcerated, and 70% had been exposed to domestic violence.

Research indicates that domestic violence occurs in between 30 to 60% of families in the child welfare system (Edelson & Eisikovits, 1996; Findlater & Kelly, 1999), and at least one mental health problem is found in approximately 70% of such families (Faller & Bellamy, 2000). Thus, it appears that the prevalence of these problems among crossover youth families is similar to that among all families in the child welfare system. What remains unclear is whether crossover youth have families that exhibit more co-occurring problems and whether the extent of the problem is greater among crossover youth families. This has significant implications for reunification of the family and the overall resiliency of the youth. Marsh, Ryan, Choi, and Testa (2005) showed that reunification is

---

2Los Angeles County estimates were taken from the U.S. Census Bureau estimates for 2005 (http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/06/06037.html) and Los Angeles Stats, 2007 (http://www.laedc.org/reports/LAStats-2007.pdf). DCFS Statistics were taken from DCFS Fact Sheet, December 31, 2004, and Probation numbers were provided to Dr. Herz from Probation for 2004. Cautionary Note: Due to the data currently available from DCFS, comparisons are made to all cases including 0-9 year olds. The proportion would probably differ in many categories if totals were limited to 10+ year olds.
less likely when more than one problem exists within the family, and Jaffee, Caspi, Moffitt, Polo-Tomas, and Taylor (2007) found the resiliency decreased as youth were exposed to more risk factors, particularly within the home.

School

The majority of crossover youth in Los Angeles were enrolled in school, but 51% of these youth were truant or not attending school regularly, 47% were engaging in problem behaviors at school that resulted in suspensions, and 49% were not performing well academically. Twenty one percent were classified as learning disabled. Across gender, females were more likely to be truant or have poor attendance than males, and males were more likely to engage in problem behavior at school. Males were also slightly more likely than females to have a learning disability.

In Arizona, 67% of crossover youth on probation had a truancy history and 59% were experiencing academic deficiencies/problems. Twenty-three percent of these youth had or were suspected to have a learning disability. Females in this sample were less likely than males to have a learning disability or be in special education, but they were more likely than their male counterparts to be truant and to experience academic or behavioral problems at school.

Kelley et al. (1997) found a similar pattern albeit in to a more limited extent. Thirty-three percent of crossover youth had a cumulative GPA of less than 2.0 compared to only 23% of youth without a maltreatment history.
Offense Type

With regard to the most recent offense, 40% of Los Angeles County crossover youth were charged with a violent offense (i.e., assault, assault with a deadly weapon, or robbery), 28% were charged with a property offense, and 25% were charged with an “other” offense. It is important to note that all violent offenses are not equal. First, misdemeanor and felony offenses were combined in this analysis, and the charge may not reflect the actual context of the situation in which the offense occurred. For instance, in one case, throwing an un-ripened avocado at a staff member resulted in an assault with a deadly weapon charge. The lack of clarity surrounding the arrest charge is significant and highlights the need to look beyond final charge data to better understand each unique incident. This is particularly true given that many of these charges occurred in group homes: 42% of violent offenses, 48% of alcohol and drug offenses, and 61% of warrants and probation violations. Slightly more than 50% of these youths were detained in juvenile hall for at least one day as a result of their offense.

Using the Arizona JOLTS data, 28% were charged with a felony or misdemeanor violent offense, 37% were charged with a felony or misdemeanor property offense, 11% were charged with a drug offense, and 24% were charged with an “other” offense. Crossover youth were more likely to be charged with a violent offense compared to delinquency-only youth placed on probation supervision. However, crossover youth were slightly less likely (27% compared to 31%) to be charged with a violent offense compared to delinquency-only youth placed in a probation placement.

Based on self-report delinquency, 70% of the youth with maltreatment histories in Kelley et al. (1997) engaged in some type of violent crime, and 79% engaged in general delinquency. Comparisons of delinquency by seriousness yielded slightly different results. Maltreated youth were most likely to report engaging in moderate delinquency (71%) followed by minor delinquency (45%) and serious delinquency (42%). Delinquency was 8-15% higher among crossover youth compared to youth without a history of maltreatment in all categories of delinquency; however, the relationship between maltreatment and delinquency was stronger for more serious rather than less serious forms of delinquency.

Prior Involvement in the Juvenile Justice System

Subsequent to arrest, 68% of crossover youth in Los Angeles County had some level of official contact with the juvenile justice system. In Arizona, 73% of active dependent youth between the ages of 14-17 had been referred to delinquency court for at least one referral in the past; 57% had been petitioned to delinquency court; and 49% had been placed on probation supervision.

Crossover youth in Arizona also had more extensive court histories than delinquency-only youth as measured by the average number of prior referrals and petitions. Crossover youth had an average of 8.2 referrals and 4.4 petitions compared to 5.6 referrals and 3.1 petitions for delinquency-only cases.

3 The “other” category included offenses such as vandalism, disturbing the peace, obstructing a police officer, warrant, violation of probation.
When comparisons were restricted to delinquency-only youth in probation placements, crossover youth had slightly fewer average referrals and petitions (8.2: 8.7 referrals and 4.4: 4.8 petitions, respectively).

Virtually all of Los Angeles crossover youth (98%) had at least one out-of-home placement. Typically, placement in out-of-home care was not temporary, but rather involved multiple placements over long durations of time.

**Placement History**

All of the Arizona youth in the case file dataset (N=204) had a history of at least one out-of-home placement. Forty percent had been placed with a relative at some point, 14% in a foster care placement, and 90% percent had been placed in a group home. The average number of placement for these youth was 10.3 placements, and in total, these youth spent a total of 938 days in out-of-placement care. Additionally, 89% had a history of placement in juvenile detention centers, 15% had a history of placement in state corrections, and 51% had a history of running away from a placement (i.e., AWOL).

The data in Los Angeles demonstrate a nearly identical pattern. Virtually all of Los Angeles crossover youth (98%) had at least one out-of-home placement. Typically, placement in out-of-home care was not temporary, but rather involved multiple placements over long durations of time. Approximately, 63% had at least one placement with a relative, and the average number of times for this type of placement was 1.85. A similar proportion of crossover youth (62%) had at least one group home placement, but the average number of group home placements was higher at 3.22. Seventy-two percent of youth were placed in non-kinship foster care homes – with an average of 3.66 placements. Similar to crossover youth in Arizona, 50% of Los Angeles crossover youth had a history of running away, or going ‘AWOL’ from their placement.

In general, crossover youth in Los Angeles appear to be youths who enter the system relatively early and do not leave DCFS care for long periods of time. When reading case files, it was not uncommon to find that these youths were initially placed in a relative or non-relative foster care placement until rebellious behaviors led foster parents to ask for a removal. Foster care placements were used until youths’ behaviors escalated, leading to a group home placement. Group home placements were rarely successful. In fact, 40% of the crossover youths were living at a group home at the time of the arrest. This statistic becomes critically important when the nature of arrest is considered. At least one-third (31%) of all arrests were related to placement (i.e., the offense occurred at the youth’s placement), and two-thirds (66%) of all placement-related offenses occurred at a group home.
Mental Health and Substance Abuse Problems

The majority of crossover youth, regardless of the study, suffered from mental health problems and/or substance abuse. In Arizona, 80% had an indication of substance abuse, 61% had an indication of emotional/mental health issues, and 27% had a history of suicide ideation/threats. In Los Angeles, 28% had an indication of a mental health problem only, 17% had an indication of a substance abuse problem only, and 38% had indication of a co-occurrence (i.e., both mental health and substance abuse problems). In total, 83% of Los Angeles crossover youth had a mental health and/or a substance abuse problem. Likewise, Kelley et al. (1997) found that children with maltreatment histories were more likely to have substance abuse and mental health problems. According to their results, 43% had a substance abuse problem and 26% had a mental health problem. These data also show that children with maltreatment are at a greater risk for both substance abuse and mental health problems compared to children without a maltreatment history. Specifically, the risk for substance abuse was approximately one-third greater for maltreated youth, and the risk for mental health problems was approximately three-quarters greater for maltreated youth.

Juvenile Court Dispositions

The study in Los Angeles used all crossover youth facing adjudication for a delinquency charge. Thus, these data offered the opportunity to examine the disposition outcomes for these cases. Only 10% of youths had their cases dismissed by the court. The majority of youth remained dependency wards with informal probation (61%), and approximately one-third (29%) of youth became delinquency wards of the delinquency court and had their dependency court status terminated (see Chapter 3 for a description of separate jurisdiction for the handling of crossover youth).

Regression analyses were completed to assess which characteristics were significantly related to a youth becoming a ward of the delinquency court relative to other disposition outcomes (Herz & Ryan, in press). The following risk factors significantly increased the likelihood of becoming a delinquency ward:

- Living with a relative or in a group home (vs. living in a foster care placement)
- Having a history of running away from a placement
- Having previous crossover referrals
- Being detained at juvenile hall after arrest
- Having a substance abuse problem

Halemba et al. (2004) did not directly examine disposition outcomes for crossover youth, but at least one finding is related to the outcomes received in juvenile court. According to the JOLTS data, 37% of crossover youth spent time in a probation-funded private placement (i.e., group home or residential placement) compared to only 4% of delinquency-only youth. This reinforces the general finding that crossover youth receive harsher outcomes compared to offenders without a dependency case (Ryan et al., 2007; see Chapter 3 for a more complete review of literature on juvenile justice outcomes for crossover youth).
Risk Levels

Following the collection of crossover data in Los Angeles, the Los Angeles County Probation Department validated its risk assessment tool and recalibrated the scoring to identify nine areas of risks/strengths: Delinquent Behavior; Delinquent Affiliations; Delinquent Orientation; Substance Abuse; Family Interactions; Interpersonal Relations; Social Isolation; Academic Engagement; and Self-Regulation (Yoo & Sosna, 2007). These scales, in turn, calculate overall risk to re-offend and provide guidance on which domains the youth needs intervention. The scoring for the tool was applied to a sub-group of first-time offenders from the data collected by Herz and Ryan (N=226; see Herz, Harada, Lecklitner, Rauso, & Ryan, 2007 for more description of this process). Although the data did not allow a perfect application of the tool, it was suitable enough to generate scores for each of the scales.

The results of this analysis indicated that 51% of crossover youth fell into the low risk category, 41% fell into the moderate risk category, and 8% fell into the high risk category. Need for intervention varied by risk, with high risk youths requiring more intervention than moderate and low risk youth with only one exception. The majority of crossover youth in all risk groups (>80%) scored in the “need intervention” category for family intervention; in fact, family intervention was the highest need area among all offenders regardless of risk level. Interventions to reduce delinquent orientation (i.e., attitudes favorable to delinquency), and improve academic engagement were the next highest categories for high and moderate risk offenders. Improving academic engagement and reducing social isolation were the most pressing areas for intervention with low risk offenders.

Recidivism

Recidivism data for Los Angeles crossover youth were retrieved for the period covering April 1, 2004 to December 31, 2005. The overall recidivism rate for this population was 28%, but recidivism rates significantly differed when levels of risk were considered. Low risk offenders had a recidivism rate of 16%, moderate risk offenders had a rate of 30%, and high risk offenders had a rate of 41%. Recidivism rates across risk levels were further mediated by mental health problems (i.e., need for mental health). The presence of mental health problems, for example, increased recidivism among low risk offenders by 53% (13% to 20%) and among moderate risk offenders by 45% (22% to 32%).

Halemba et al. (2004) also measured delinquency for all first-time offenders identified in the JOLTS data during FY 2002. Recidivism was measured by another referral for a delinquency matter up

---

4 Recidivism is measured by any new charges within the follow-up time period. This measure does not account for how the charges were adjudicated (i.e., dismissed or otherwise).
5 The data currently do not provide a way to account for “time at risk” for recidivism. A certain percentage of these offenders, for instance, were placed in correctional facilities for some portion of time after their disposition. In these cases, youths would not be “at risk” for recidivism, and as a result, the recidivism rates presented above could be artificially low.
6 Findings for high risk are not reported because all but two high risk offenders fell into the high risk/mental health category.
through August 2003. Crossover youth were twice as likely as delinquent-only youth to recidivate during this time period (62% compared to 30%, respectively). Female crossover youth had a slightly higher recidivism rate than males (65% compared to 61%); however, female delinquency-only youth had a much lower recidivism rate than male delinquency-only youth (23% compared to 33%).

The absence of data on the prevalence of crossover youth is exceptionally concerning and addressing this problem should be prioritized by policy-makers and administrators at all levels.

Summary

The absence of data on the prevalence of crossover youth is exceptionally concerning and addressing this problem should be prioritized by policy-makers and administrators at all levels. Without clear estimates to document the problem, attempts to improve the handling of crossover youth will undoubtedly fall short of their full potential. Measuring prevalence requires commitment from agencies, but it is not terribly difficult or cumbersome. At best, systems should work to integrate or share their information systems, and at worst, systems should mandate that basic data fields useful for identifying crossover youth be completed. Additionally, interagency workgroups could develop a protocol to match data across information systems on an annual basis in order to track prevalence. Each of these methods provides the opportunity to not only document the number of crossover youth but also to track these youth over time to measure outcomes. For states and jurisdictions that implement collaborative approaches, these data can also be used to assess the effectiveness of these approaches.

The research on crossover characteristics points to several additional issues that should guide policy, practice, and research discussions. More investigation and special attention should be given to the role that gender and race play in crossover populations. African-Americans are consistently overrepresented in these populations; yet, clear explanations for this finding are practically non-existent. The prevalence of female offenders and their related risk for a variety of problem behaviors is escalated among crossover populations. Not only do females have worse outcomes compared to males, but Kelley et al. (1997) also showed that these young girls are more likely to become pregnant than girls without a history of maltreatment (52% compared to 34%). These findings, in combination with the results for mental health and substance abuse problems, emphasize the need to further investigate the prevalence of trauma among crossover youth and the extent to which youth with trauma histories receive appropriate counseling and interventions immediately (or as soon as possible) after the event(s). There is growing research to indicate that a substantial number of dependent and delinquent youth experience trauma but receive little or no intervention, resulting in the development and/or escalation of mental health and substance abuse problems (Taylor & Siegfried, 2005).
Similar to the results presented in Chapter 1, group homes remain questionable placements for crossover youth. Although it is unclear whether group homes increase delinquency under all conditions, the evidence regarding their criminogenic impact on crossover youth is undeniable. Thus, understanding the conditions under which group homes may be appropriate placements (i.e., when risk and treatment levels are matched to the services at the group home) should be a primary topic of interest to policy-makers, practitioners, and researchers.

Related to the role of placements is the exceptionally high need for family intervention among crossover youth. On one hand, this is an expected finding since court intervention originated from abuse/neglect typically within the family; however, the absence of appropriate family intervention and a lack of coordination between family intervention and other interventions, amplifies the problems of finding and sustaining appropriate placements for these youth. Both Multisystemic Therapy and Multi-Dimensional Treatment Foster Care, for example, are evidence-based programs directed at the problems exhibited in the crossover population, but they are often difficult to access, and when they are available, many crossover youth are prevented from participating because they do not have a stable family environment or foster care placement to which they can return. Consequently, many crossover youth find themselves shuffled across multiple group home placements until they can emancipate from the system.

A review of research related to the link between maltreatment and delinquency, as well as the characteristics of crossover youth, stresses the need to develop a coordinated and informed research agenda that examines a range of issues including, but not limited to: the role of representation on outcomes, the causes for racial disparities, disparities in the way crossover youth are handled in the juvenile justice system, the effect of collaborative approaches on a variety of outcomes, and the effectiveness of various types of programs with crossover youth, including programs that are classified as evidence-based programs.

Taken together, the findings from this literature clearly demonstrate the multi-dimensional needs of crossover youth and the complexities they present to single agency/system approaches. These results leave little question that collaborative approaches are essential to effectively addressing the needs of these youth.
Despite a tremendous need for comprehensive and coordinated care, crossover youth typically fall through the crack that separates the child welfare and juvenile justice systems due to system fragmentation and poor communication. The absence of coordinated responses for youth who cross into both systems is particularly concerning because these youth often present a complexity of problems that require multisystem responses rather than single agency oversight (see Chapter 2). Research indicates that crossover youth are more likely than youth without maltreatment histories to receive harsher court outcomes in the delinquency court (Ryan, Herz, Hernandez, & Marshall, 2007; Morris & Freundlich, 2004; Conger & Ross, 2001; Jonson-Reid & Barth, 2000) which negatively impacts the likelihood that they will receive appropriate treatment programming (Freundlich & Bockstein, 2003; McMackin & Fulwiler, 2001; Pumarieg et al., 1999). Without appropriate services, crossover youth are more likely to suffer from mental health problems and drug addiction and to continue engaging in criminal behavior into adulthood (Widom & Maxfield, 2001).

A growing body of literature highlights the systemic problems related to serving the needs of crossover youth and calls for states to improve collaboration across child welfare, juvenile justice, mental health, and education systems. Wiig and Tuell (2004), for instance, offer a roadmap to jurisdictions that take steps to address the crossover issue within their state. Building on Martinson’s (1999) work, they encourage jurisdictions to conceptualize collaboration as two types of interrelated activity: integration and coordination (Wiig & Tuell, 2004). Integration involves developing a new system that provides an infrastructure to support coordination across agencies. Integrated/shared information systems, written protocols between agencies, and blended funding approaches are a few examples of integration. Coordination involves the development of specific programs and procedures intended to improve information-sharing across and within agencies, such as multidisciplinary assessment and case management. Although a jurisdiction can focus on integration or coordination efforts, the two are ultimately inseparable for building effective, sustainable multisystem approaches.

The purpose of this chapter is to summarize the current state of affairs with regard to these issues. Specifically, this chapter will summarize the literature related to the processing of crossover youth in the juvenile justice system, consider how the crossover issue is viewed by different stakeholders, discuss the impact of statutory definitions on the handling of crossover youth, and review the types of collaborative approaches currently used in jurisdictions across the nation. Both a review of extant literature and the results from a nationwide survey are used to accomplish these tasks.

 Respondents for this study included a convenience sample of: State administrators for child protective services, state administrators for juvenile probation, state administrators for juvenile institutional corrections, juvenile justice specialists, county administrators for child protective services, county administrators for probation, county administrators for juvenile corrections, and juvenile court judges. Please see Appendix A for a description of the procedures used in conducting the survey and for a summary of response rates.
Research Related to the Processing of Crossover Youth

Although the link between abuse/neglect and delinquency is well-established in the child welfare and juvenile justice literatures (see Chapter 1 for more discussion of this issue), the handling of dependent youths who cross into delinquency remains largely unexplored. Research from a limited number of studies concludes that crossover youth receive harsher processing outcomes compared to delinquent youths who have no connection to the dependency system (Ryan, Herz, Hernandez, & Marshall, 2007; Morris & Freundlich, 2004; Conger & Ross, 2001; Jonson-Reid & Barth, 2000). In perhaps the most detailed study of dependent youth in the juvenile justice system, researchers at the Vera Institute of Justice examined 13,000 juvenile pre-adjudication detention decisions in New York City between 1997 and 1999 (Conger & Ross, 2001). The authors concluded that foster youth without prior involvement in juvenile correction were more likely to be detained compared to non-dependent delinquent youth. Specifically, “the probability of detention for youth in foster care was 10 percentage points higher than the probability of youth not in foster care, controlling for other influences (p. 3).” Complementing this research, Morris and Freundlich (2004) interviewed a variety of stakeholders (e.g. foster parents, young adults, judges, and child welfare administrators) about foster youth experiences in the juvenile justice system. The authors concluded that the offenses associated with dependent youth entering the juvenile justice system were less serious compared to non-dependent delinquents, and that many stakeholders believed crossover youth were treated differently than their delinquency-only counterparts. Differential decision-making was perceived to be related to decision-makers’ perceptions of the living arrangements of these youth (e.g. group home placement) and their perceptions of the youth’s risk to re-offend. The authors also reported that foster youth were consistently dissatisfied with their legal representation and felt that the punishments were often more severe for dependent youth. Similarly, foster parents expressed concerns about perceived inequities of judicial dispositions for foster youth.

These concerns are validated in a recent study conducted in Los Angeles County, California by Ryan, Herz, Hernandez, and Marshall (2007). Results showed that delinquency cases originating in child welfare were less likely to receive probation, controlling for a wide range of factors including age, gender, race, and type of offense. The authors investigated the likelihood of case dismissal, and the likelihood of the following judicial dispositions: probation, suitable placement, and correctional placement. Suitable placements refer to group homes most often supervised by probation. Correctional placements refer to delinquency camps supervised by probation and placement with the California Youth Authority (CYA). The relative probabilities reveal differences between these dispositional groups for DCFS (58% probation, 21% suitable placement, 21% correctional) and non DCFS youth (73% probation, 11% suitable placement, 16% correctional) (see figure 4).
So rather than probation, adolescents moving from child welfare to juvenile justice were more likely to enter correctional placements including delinquency camps and secure group homes supervised by juvenile probation (see also Halemba et al., (2004) for a similar finding).

In short, adolescents coming to juvenile justice from child welfare are at a clear disadvantage. They are more likely to experience detention, and more likely to get pushed deeper into the juvenile justice system—again, controlling for other important covariates such as age, race, prior offense history, and current offense. This is problematic on three fronts. First, residential programs are significantly less effective for reducing the likelihood of continued delinquent offending as compared with court supervised probation and community-based programs (Lipsey, 1992). Second, it is not clear how residential programs within juvenile justice systems address issues related to family violence and child safety. Juvenile offenders are best served in community-based programs that improve pro-social skills, focus on problem solving with the youth and his/her family, and are highly structured and intensive. The evidence suggests that probation and augmented forms of probation (e.g. restitution) are the most effective (Lipsey, 1992). Yet adolescents entering the juvenile justice system via child welfare are less likely to receive such programming, regardless of the crime committed. Instead, crossover youth enter group homes and other residential settings. Such environments increase the likelihood of associating with deviant peer groups, and reinforce antisocial attitudes, values, and beliefs (Dodge, Lansford, & Dishion, 2006). Moreover, adolescents leaving these programs are at an increased risk of recidivism and an increased risk of entering the adult correctional system.

Third, mental health and substance abuse problems may increase the further penetration of the delinquency system, especially if the juvenile court believes that the child welfare system has not adequately addressed these problems. In particular, dependent youth with these problems may be viewed as needing more attention than their delinquent-only counterparts. The juvenile justice system’s ability to provide effective mental health and substance abuse treatment, however, is rarely more promising than the child welfare system’s ability to appropriately meet the complex needs of this population (McMackin & Fulwiler, 2001; Pumariega et al., 1999).
Conducting assessments for and providing appropriate levels of supervision and treatment to crossover youths is particularly challenging because it requires coordination across the dependency and delinquency court systems. While there is a growing amount of literature that documents the need to integrate treatment and accountability to successfully reduce recidivism, there is little evidence to indicate that such integration is occurring across systems (Brezina, 1998; GAO, 2003; Halemba & Lord, 2005; McMackin & Fulwiler, 2001; Pumariega et al., 1999). In fact, it appears that fragmentation across systems amplifies problems for crossover youth. Unfortunately, social service, mental health, and probation departments within the same jurisdiction have conflicting missions and philosophies (i.e., to protect and rehabilitate v. to punish), different professional training (i.e., social work and clinical v. criminal justice), and different funding streams (i.e., Department of Health and Human Services vs. State Probation Administration) that often thwart collaboration.

Importance of the Crossover Issue to Key Stakeholders

A state and/or jurisdiction’s willingness to address the problems related to handling crossover youth depends on various stakeholder’s recognition of the issue (Wiig & Tuell, 2007). Since it is widely accepted that effective handling of crossover youth requires interagency and intra-agency cooperation, agencies, service providers, and policy-makers must not only recognize the crossover issue, but also prioritize it for attention. The nationwide survey conducted as part of this study presents a unique opportunity to measure the perceived importance placed on the crossover issue from a variety of stakeholders.

Table 3.1: Perceived Level of Importance of the Crossover Issue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance to stakeholder</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Importance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance to You Personally</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>84.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance to Probation</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>71.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance to Child Welfare</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Importance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance to Mental Health</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance to Institutional Corrections</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>55.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance to Education Providers</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Importance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance to Governor</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance to County Governing Boards</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance to the Legislature</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.1 shows the percentage of respondents who rated various stakeholders’ view of the crossover issue as “important or very important.” The results naturally classify stakeholders into one of three groups: high importance, moderate importance, and low importance. Respondents believed the crossover issue was considered most important to themselves (84.9%), probation (71.9%), and child welfare (69.2%). The issue was perceived to be the least important to the governor (33.5%), county governing boards (30.8%), and the state legislature (28.1%). Stakeholders who fell in the moderate category included mental health (60.5%), corrections (55.1%), and education (41.1%).

Not surprisingly, importance for the crossover issue was highest among those agencies impacted directly, moderate for agencies impacted indirectly, and lowest for stakeholders who were the most removed from the issue on a daily basis. While these results may fit with expectations, they have significant implications for the development and sustainability of multisystem approaches. Well-developed policy and sufficient funding are necessary for the development of integration and coordination across and within systems. If these results accurately reflect reality, they infer that policy-makers may be indifferent to providing such resources, which in turn, could detrimentally impact the long-term success of efforts to build multisystem approaches for crossover youth.

Statutory Definitions of Crossover Youth

The handling of crossover youth is dictated, to a large degree, by state laws that define jurisdiction for crossover youth. There are three statutory approaches used in the United States: concurrent jurisdiction, “on-hold” jurisdiction, and separate jurisdiction. States with concurrent jurisdiction allow a youth to be under the jurisdiction of the dependency court and delinquency court simultaneously. Under concurrent jurisdiction, a lead agency approach is common, whereby child protective services and probation work with the court to determine which agency will have primary responsibility over the youth’s care. Concurrent jurisdiction allows for a youth’s termination from the care of child protective services (e.g., a youth charged in adult court), but these conditions vary widely by state. The use of an “on-hold” status is similar to concurrent jurisdiction with only a slight difference. Cases placed “on-hold” receive a temporary interruption in services provided by child protective services until delinquency court dispositions are completed. Thirty-eight states and the District of Columbia use concurrent jurisdiction, two states use “on-hold” jurisdiction, and an additional nine use hybrids of both approaches (Dunlap, 2006; Krinsky, 2004).

Concurrent jurisdiction yields several advantages. Perhaps most importantly, this approach allows youth under the care of child protective services to retain family/dependency court involvement and his/her current placement (if appropriate). A crossover youth in a concurrent jurisdiction state also has access, at least theoretically, to a full array of services offered in child protective services, probation, and institutional corrections. Also, concurrent jurisdictions readily integrate treatment services with supervision from the juvenile justice system. The disadvantages associated with concurrent jurisdiction are few, but nonetheless important to consider. Concurrent jurisdiction does not necessarily equate with effective collaboration across systems and agencies. When an “on-hold”

\[\text{NOTE: This terminology is widely recognized, but not standardized. To date, there is no standard definition for jurisdictional approaches.}\]
status is used, for example, the most serious offenders are separated from collaborative efforts and left in the sole care of institutional corrections. The promise of concurrent jurisdiction, then, may remain unfulfilled, and even worse, crossover youth may flounder because no system or agency takes responsibility for his/her ultimate well-being. This point, ironically, was used by opponents in California to argue against concurrent jurisdiction in 2002 (Dunlap, 2006). Representatives of the child welfare system argued that youth would receive worse care under concurrent jurisdiction as a result of interagency confusion over roles and responsibilities, interagency conflict, duplication of services, and a lack of agency accountability.

In stark contrast to concurrent jurisdiction, separate jurisdiction does not allow a youth to be under the jurisdiction of the dependency court and the delinquency court simultaneously. In this case, the law typically outlines a court process to determine whether a case will remain in the dependency system or the delinquency system. In the event that delinquency court is given jurisdiction, the dependency case and all services provided through child protective services are terminated. Only one state, California, currently operates under separate jurisdiction. Once a youth under the care of child protective services in California is charged with delinquency, for example, California Welfare and Institutions Code (WIC) 241.1 outlines a process for determining whether a crossover youth will remain under the supervision of child protective services (the Department of Children and Family Services—DCFS) or become a ward of the delinquency court. WIC 241.1 requires probation and DCFS to submit a joint assessment report to the court for consideration in the 241.1 hearing. Outcomes in the 241.1 hearing process include (1) dismissal of the case; (2) retention of the case in the dependency court with informal probation ordered by the delinquency court; or (3) termination of the dependency case and formal probation (i.e., youth becomes a ward of delinquency court).

While the separate jurisdiction approach has many pitfalls, it potentially offers one advantage for crossover youth. There is a deliberate and concentrated effort by all parties to keep crossover youth in the dependency system. Between April 1 and December 31, 2004, only 29% of 241.1 cases resulted in the youth becoming wards of delinquency court. Ten percent were dismissed and 61% remained under the dependency court with informal probation (Herz & Ryan, in press). Once placed on informal probation, a youth can avoid a delinquency record if he/she successfully completes the conditions of the court order. Youth in concurrent jurisdictions do not necessarily have the same opportunity.

The primary shortcomings of separate jurisdiction are related to loss. Once a youth is made a ward of the delinquency court, he/she loses all access to services and treatment provided through the dependency system. This includes family treatment with parents and siblings. Additionally, he/she loses the attorney that served his/her best interests in the dependency court, his/her court appointed special advocate (CASA), his/her social worker, and his/her placement, which potentially severs sibling relationships and other emotional ties to placement. These losses, in turn, potentially impact the youth’s level of attachment with others and his/her trust of the system and adult role models. Another shortcoming involves the youth’s length of stay in the delinquency system. Once a crossover youth enters the delinquency system under separate jurisdiction, for example, the youth may remain in the system longer because he/she has no safe home to return to (Krinsky, 2004; Wiig & Tuell, 2007).
The problems inherent in the separate jurisdiction approach have not gone unnoticed in California. In 2004, Assembly Bill 129 was passed by the California legislature (Benningson, 2004; Center for Families, Children, & the Courts, 2007). AB 129 gave California counties the opportunity to experiment with dual jurisdiction approaches. In other words, AB 129 temporarily allowed crossover youth to be wards of both dependency and delinquency in counties that developed protocol to pilot the use of dual jurisdiction. The pilot approach was voluntary, and as of January 1, 2007, 7 of 58 counties had implemented dual jurisdiction protocol (Center for Families, Children, & the Courts, 2007).

Regardless of the statutory definition for handling crossover youth, the multiple service needs of these youth demand the use of collaborative approaches across systems and agencies. Concurrent jurisdiction, however, more readily supports integration and coordination efforts. As indicated above, though, the potential to provide good care does not guarantee its implementation. To consider how integration and coordination have been achieved across the nation, we turn next to a review of promising approaches used to improve the handling of crossover youth.

**Collaborative Approaches Currently Used to Handle Crossover Youth**

Despite the strong and consistent calls for collaborative efforts, the use of integration and coordination for handling crossover youth has received surprisingly little attention in the literature. The most comprehensive work in this area was completed by Siegel and Lord (2004). In “When Systems Collide: Improving Court Practices and Programs in Dual Jurisdiction Cases,” Siegel and Lord identify promising court-based or court-linked practices and programs based on the authors’ experience working with jurisdictions, a broad-based literature review, and a survey of 96 jurisdictions across the nation. This process yielded five areas within which promising approaches were categorized: Screening and Assessment, Case Assignment, Case Flow Management, Case Planning and Supervision, and Interagency Collaboration.

The category Screening and Assessment includes the identification of offenders as crossover youth as early in the delinquency process as possible and the use of standardized assessment tools to develop case plans tailored to individual risks and needs. Procedures used to keep a case under the direction of the same decision-makers and advocates for court processing are captured in Case Assignment. Case Flow Management involves any efforts to “provide for the substance and timely handling” of court proceedings for crossover youth. Improving coordination across agencies for court recommendations and case management define Case Planning and Supervision. Each of the preceding categories represent coordination efforts—i.e., the implementation of policies and procedures to impact the assessment and oversight of cases on a daily basis. The last category, Interagency Collaboration, represents efforts to build better infrastructure across systems; consequently, Interagency Collaboration represents the integration component of collaboration.

---

9 Los Angeles County submitted its dual jurisdiction after the submission of the 2007 report, raising the total number of counties implementing AB129 to eight.
Siegel and Lord’s (2004) work has become seminal with regard to identifying promising collaborative approaches used to handle crossover youth. Research recently completed by Herz, Estep, and Dunlap (2005), Halemba and Lord (2005), and Petro (2007) expands upon Siegel and Lord’s work. Herz et al. (2005) conducted phone interviews with 14 jurisdictions (representing 12 states) highlighted in “When Systems Collide…” to gather more detailed information about the approaches they used and the strengths and weaknesses of those approaches. Halemba and Lord (2005) visited four counties in Ohio to further investigate the challenges encountered when implementing collaborative approaches for handling crossover youth, and Petro (2007) conducted a phone survey with 71 representatives from child welfare and/or probation in 43 states to identify unique practices, programs, or policies used for crossover youth.

Using the framework offered in Siegel and Lord (2004), jurisdiction examples of promising approaches are reviewed in order to highlight the characteristics of different approaches as well as their related strengths and weaknesses. As will be evident from this review, the use of promising approaches is not static. In other words, jurisdictions that implement one type of promising approach typically implement other collaborative approaches as well. Thus, Siegel and Lord’s categories are useful heuristic devices, but not exclusive in nature. It is also important to note that the examples highlighted in this section are used for illustrative purposes only and are not intended to represent an exhaustive list of jurisdictions using promising approaches (see, for example, Compendium of Family Court Practices, 2006; Arizona Department of Corrections, 2005; CWLA, 2005; CWLA, 2003).  

Screening and Assessment

Several practices are identified in the Screening and Assessment category, including the use of formal delinquency notification protocols, structured decision-making tools, and one-stop interagency intake assessment and screening centers. Examples of these approaches are found in New York City, New York, the State of Connecticut, Jefferson County, Alabama, and Sacramento, California.

The Administration of Children’s Services’ (ACS) Confirm project (formerly known as Project Confirm) in New York City, New York was created to address interagency communication and coordination issues between the child welfare system and juvenile justice system in New York City (Tuell, 2001; Conger & Ross, 2006). Upon admission of a juvenile to a pre-adjudication detention facility, an ACS Confirm screener searches the child welfare system database to determine whether the child is in foster care. If the youth is a foster child, the ACS staff contacts the social worker and probation officer/detention staff assigned to the case to provide important information, such as detention visitation, contact information, medical conditions, and other child welfare information. The social worker is required to attend the minor’s court hearings for the duration of the detention. After notification, ACS Confirm staff meet with key players in the case to ensure that caseworkers,

---

10 Readers are encouraged to refer to Siegel & Lord for a more detailed description of each category and specific approaches contained in each category. Jurisdiction examples of promising approaches are primarily drawn from interviews conducted in Herz et al. (2005) and Halemba and Lord (2005).
probation officers, and other involved parties participate in the court process for the duration of the minor’s detention.

Overall, the ACS Confirm program has increased the flow of information and coordination between delinquency and dependency agencies, caseworkers’ awareness and attendance at delinquency hearings, and system accountability for delivering a continuity of care to crossover youth. Recent evaluation of this program also showed success in reducing pre-adjudication detention for crossover youth, particularly for females, Hispanic youth, and youth charged with less serious crimes (Conger & Ross, 2006).

Despite significant progress, ACS Confirm continues to struggle with caseworkers who are reluctant to get involved in the delinquency case, poor attendance at delinquency hearings due to long distances, and inefficient information-sharing due to confidentiality and turf boundaries. Conger & Ross’ (2006) evaluation also found that detention increased for crossover youth charged with more serious crimes. The authors, ironically, attributed this finding to improvements in information-sharing across court decision-makers. More accurate information about youth, especially with regard to AWOL history, became available to prosecutors. While such information did not seem to matter in less serious cases, it was a critical piece of information for more serious cases.

In Connecticut, the Department of Child and Family Services places liaisons in the pre-detention facilities to run new intakes through their computer system in order to identify crossover youth (Herz et al., 2005). Following the identification of a crossover case, the liaison contacts the social worker and probation office to initiate a planning process. In Jefferson County, Alabama, offenders are immediately referred to a specialized unit within probation once he/she is identified as a dependent youth. Two probation officers with expertise in both probation and social services assess the risks and needs of the youth using a specialized instrument. This information is then used by the probation officer to prepare recommendations for the court. The assessment is conducted before adjudication and is used for case planning. The probation officers in this unit are responsible for managing all crossover youths. Similarly, the State of New Mexico uses a structured decision-making tool to determine where a client should be placed and how often they should be visited in the field.

These approaches assess a youth’s needs at the beginning of the adjudication process, result in the development of coordinated case plans, and capitalize on resources offered by both probation and child protective services. Unfortunately, the effectiveness of these approaches is potentially hampered by interagency conflicts regarding “the best interest of a child” and judges who are unwilling to follow the recommendations.

The probation department in Sacramento, CA operates a one-stop interagency intake assessment and screening center for youth facing placement post-adjudication. This center was originally funded by grants, but is now sustained primarily using mental health MediCal and probation funding. The center is a one-stop residential (21 beds) center used to comprehensively assess a youth prior to placement. The facility is located close to the courthouse, and it offers educational programming, medical services, evaluation services, and other support services. The average stay for offenders is approximately 30 days. During this time, the offenders are observed in structured and unstructured ways. A multi-disciplinary assessment team then reviews the case, and makes final decisions about the case plan. Assessment information is provided to the recommended placement, and the probation
officer remains assigned to the case except in special circumstances. Although the center is not limited to crossover offenders, a large portion of those served fall into the crossover category.

The benefits of a one-stop assessment center are several. Co-located services facilitate better communication and collaboration across multidisciplinary entities, probation officers become knowledgeable about different systems, and evaluators have the ability to observe offenders in different contexts and over time. Ultimately, a more thorough understanding of the case results in better case planning, better treatment, and more appropriate placements. Unfortunately, these assessments are completed after adjudication rather than before adjudication. Furthermore, funding continues to present challenges, since MediCal is limited in coverage, leaving substance abuse, educational needs, and certain medical services uncovered.

**Case Assignment**

Case assignment approaches consolidate court processing so that the dependency and delinquency cases are handled simultaneously and are supervised by attorneys familiar with both systems. At least three types of approaches fall into this category: one family/one judge, dedicated dockets, and special qualifications for attorneys. Examples of these approaches are found in Allegheny County, Pennsylvania; Bernalillo County, New Mexico; Maricopa County, Arizona; Jefferson County, Alabama; and Palm Beach County, Florida.

The one family/one judge approach is used in all of the counties listed above. In these cases, a single judge hears both the dependency and delinquency matters. In addition to the one family/one judge approach, many of these jurisdictions require continuity of counsel for both the dependency case and the delinquency case. A dedicated docket approach is used in Allegheny County, Pennsylvania, for post-adjudication delinquency and child welfare review hearings. Probation officers, caseworkers, and dependency/delinquency attorneys are required to attend the post-adjudication hearings. To facilitate interagency communication, cross-training is provided to all new probation and child welfare personnel, and supervisors from both agencies meet monthly to discuss new issues and improvement in handling dual jurisdiction cases.

One family/one judge, dedicated dockets, and continuity of counsel provide consistency in oversight, require active involvement by the judge, facilitate communication between agencies, improve case planning, and hold agencies as well as service providers accountable. The only barrier cited in this area was related to the challenges of knowing the expectations of two different systems and learning how to more effectively communicate across agencies.

**Case Flow Management & Case Planning and Management**

Siegel and Lord’s (2004) categories for Case Flow Management and Case Planning and Supervision are distinct in definition, but quite similar in application. Both categories reference approaches intended to streamline information and improve coordinated case management. Consequently, they are combined for the current discussion. Collectively, they include the following types of procedures and programs: joint pre-hearing conferences, combining dependency and delinquency hearings, joint
court orders and court reports, mandatory attendance of CSW and probation officer at hearings, joint case plans, specialized case management and supervision units, multi-disciplinary team assessment and case management, special qualifications and/or training for case managers, the use of child protective services liaisons, and the use of probation liaisons. Some form of these approaches was found in Bernalillo County, New Mexico; Bexar County, Texas; Tarrant County, Texas; Connecticut; Hillsborough County, Florida; the State of New Mexico; Jefferson County, Alabama; Maricopa County, Arizona; Los Angeles County, California; and Lucas County, Ohio.

The use of dedicated units improves communication across agencies, facilitates cross-training for probation officers who, in turn, become experts for others, improves case planning and management, and improves court expectations.

Dedicated supervision units are used in Maricopa County, Arizona and Jefferson County, Alabama. In Maricopa County, Child Protective Services and Probation jointly agree which agency should take the lead in providing services on a case. Cases in which probation is the lead are assigned to a unit dedicated to supervising crossover cases. Probation officers assigned to this unit receive special training and are in daily contact with their counterparts in CPS as well as any and all agencies/service providers related to the youth’s case. In Jefferson County, two probation officers are hired and trained to handle crossover caseloads. These officers liaise between probation and social services, attend court hearings, make recommendations to the judge, develop case plans, and oversee case plans. Caseloads typically range from 35-50 cases/officer.

The use of dedicated units improves communication across agencies, facilitates cross-training for probation officers who, in turn, become experts for others, improves case planning and management, and improves court expectations. The strengths of this approach are augmented when a one family/one judge approach, a good information system, and organizational cultures supportive of collaboration are also established. Organizational differences, however, continue to present challenges to effective information-sharing and coordination across agencies, and the availability of services continues to be a problem especially for children aging out of the system.

Probation and social worker team approaches are used in Bernalillo County, New Mexico; Hillsborough County, Florida; Ramsey County, Minnesota; and the State of Connecticut. A probation officer takes the lead in handling concurrent jurisdiction cases in Bernalillo County. The youth’s social worker locates services and works with probation to find the most appropriate placement for the youth. In Hillsborough County, the probation officer or social worker takes the lead in arranging services for the child depending on the severity of the charge. The probation officer prepares and files reports with the court based on discussions and interviews with the social worker and other professionals providing services to the child. In Ramsey County, a judge may assign youth to the “Human Services Delinquency Unit.” Youth placed in this unit are then assigned a probation officer and a child protection caseworker who are jointly responsible for overseeing the youth’s case plan. The probation officer and caseworker are co-located to facilitate information-sharing and coordination of activities (Halemba & Lord, 2005). In the State of Connecticut,
probation uses Case Review Teams for offenders facing an out-of-home placement. These teams consist of probation officers, social workers, and parole officers, and are responsible for reviewing cases and making appropriate placements.

Team approaches facilitate communication across agencies, increase the likelihood that youth will receive appropriate placements, and improve coordinated case planning and management. Finding the right people to work with crossover youth, reducing high turnover rates, having integrated information systems, and finding funds to access appropriate services remain barriers to team effectiveness.

Child protective service and probation liaisons are often used to facilitate case management. In Bexar County and Tarrant County, Texas, the child protective services agency placed a child protective services (CPS) liaison in Juvenile Services to act as liaison between CPS and probation. The primary responsibilities of the CPS liaison include: providing cohesion across agencies by clarifying policies, language, etc.; accessing information from both systems for case planning; screening referrals; following up on referrals to CPS; responding to emergency situations; and participating in multi-disciplinary team meetings for youth and families with higher risks and needs. The purpose of the liaison is to cross-educate agencies on the roles and responsibilities of each agency in order to (1) avoid duplication; (2) clarify who must take a lead in different circumstances; (3) coordinate and manage the implementation of policies and procedures from both agencies in crossover cases; and (4) provide advocacy in specific cases. Additionally, all crossover cases receive joint assessments and case plans in Tarrant County, and both CPS and probation are responsible for overseeing implementation of the youth’s case plan.

A CPS liaison was also placed in the juvenile court in Lucas County, Ohio (Halemba & Lord, 2005). The duties of this liaison are similar to those in Texas. This liaison additionally facilitates an alternative placement to detention, keeps the court appraised of all developments related to a case, and provides informal services to both the youth and his/her parent(s).

Liaisons in all three areas have proven helpful because they understand all aspects of a crossover case and can quickly and efficiently identify problems as well as solutions. Consequently, the court is better informed, delays in accessing services are reduced, and youth have better outcomes (i.e., are less likely to be detained). Often, however, the crossover caseload exceeds the time available for one liaison.

A final approach used in some jurisdictions is a multi-disciplinary team (MDT) for assessment and case management of crossover youth. Los Angeles, California is currently piloting a MDT for its crossover youth. The MDT is comprised of a probation officer, a DCFS social worker, a clinician from the Department of Mental Health (DMH), and an educational liaison (i.e., an education law attorney). Dependent youth charged with a delinquent offense are automatically referred to the MDT. All members of the MDT gather information from their respective agencies about the youth involved in the case and distribute it to the team. The MDT then meets and discusses this information in order to make a joint recommendation to the court regarding (1) which dispositional option is most appropriate for the youth’s level of risk and treatment needs; and (2) what treatment and other services should be provided to the youth based on his/her risk and need levels.
Post-disposition, the MDT meets with the youth, the youth’s social worker, the assigned probation officer, and any additional relevant parties (i.e., parent/caregiver, treatment provider, placement representative, attorney, etc.) to discuss the court orders and case plan. Monthly progress reports are given to the MDT by the youth’s social worker and probation officer.

The MDT approach improves communication with the court and the development of a comprehensive case plan that integrates supervision and treatment in order to address risk and needs simultaneously. The most difficult challenges faced by the MDT are overcoming interagency conflicts related to philosophical and procedural differences, accessing mental health information due to confidentiality concerns, and the lack of availability of appropriate placements and services for crossover youth.

**Interagency Collaboration**

Interagency collaboration represents efforts to build infrastructure supports for building partnerships across agencies. Approaches found in this category include: court-facilitated interagency planning meetings, formal written agreements, collaborative funding arrangements, and integrated or shared information systems or databases. The use of formal written agreements was cited by almost all of the jurisdictions highlighted above; without such agreements, systematic application of collaborative approaches would not be possible.

In addition to written agreements, integrated information systems and shared funding significantly contribute to effective collaboration. Many areas have made progress in developing integrated information systems including (but not necessarily limited to), Arizona, Delaware, Michigan, and King County, Washington. Many jurisdictions report using pooled funding but it is unclear how such funding is accomplished (Petro, 2005). Morgan & Martin (2004, p. 39) define four basic strategies to accomplish cross-agency funding:

- **Pooling**: Combining funds from several agencies or programs into a single funding stream.
- **Coordinating**: Aligning categorical funding from a number of agencies and funding streams to support community-based initiatives.
- **Devolving**: Delegating authority for allocating funds from higher to lower levels (e.g., from state to community-based agencies or organizations).
- **Decategorizing**: Removing narrow eligibility requirements or other rules that restrict how groups can spend funding.

Hamilton County, Ohio was highlighted in Halembo & Lord (2005) for its innovative and long-standing efforts to accomplish pooled and de-categorized funding. In 1995, county commissioners in Hamilton County contracted the purchase, management, and evaluation of wrap-around services to a private vendor. Five agencies including the child protective services agency, the Juvenile Court, the Board of Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities, Community Mental Health Board, and the Alcohol and Drug Addiction Services Board collaboratively funded the program. By 2005, the program was de-categorized, and enrollment was based fully on need regardless of the youth’s involvement with any one or a combination of agencies.
Accomplishing Collaboration

Each of the examples reviewed provides insight into how jurisdictions accomplish collaboration or some aspect of it. When these examples are considered in combination with the broader literature on crossover youth, a list of requirements for collaboration and common barriers to collaboration emerges. It appears from the literature that accomplishing collaboration requires, at a minimum, the following:

- Leadership from judges.
- The development of methods to increase information-sharing, case oversight, and the provision of services across agencies.
- Timely notification of delinquency involvement, improved initial assessments, and coordinated case planning/supervision.
- Formal, written memorandums of agreement or understanding that clearly outline the roles and responsibilities of each agency.
- Cross-training for staff involved in collaborative efforts.

The barriers to collaboration are common across jurisdictions as well. The most commonly cited barriers in the literature include (Center for Families, Children, & the Courts, 2007; Petro, 2006, 2007 Halemba & Lord, 2005; Halemba et al., 2004):

- Coordination is often informal, which results in the inconsistent handling of crossover cases. The efforts related to collaboration are sporadic and dependent upon the priorities of individuals rather than the needs of the population.
- When collaborative efforts do occur, there is often confusion over the roles and responsibilities of probation and child protective services as they relate to the supervision and management of cases and to the provision of services.
- Efforts are often plagued by competition over limited funding.
- Interagency tension often surrounds the best way to proceed for a youth.
- Despite efforts to collaborate, agency staff rarely understands the perspective of staff from other agencies/systems.
- Since collaborative efforts are sporadic, guidance and support is often lacking from the state.

Although the characteristics of and barriers to collaboration are helpful in understanding collaboration, they do not quantify how often collaborative approaches are used. To measure the prevalence of these approaches, data from the nationwide survey was aggregated from 185 respondents to the 48 states they represent (see Chapter 4 for a summary of responses for individual respondents on these items). A mean was calculated across respondents for each state and an overall mean was calculated across states to measure how often a selected list of promising approaches was used. Table 3.2 displays the results of this analysis.
Table 3.2: Use of Collaborative Approaches for Handling Crossover Youth (N=48)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated dockets/one judge approach</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interagency planning meetings</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of MDT to assess and manage cases</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal delinquency notification protocols</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity of counsel</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding arrangements across CW &amp; Probation</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint case plans</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured decision-making tools</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of child protective service liaisons</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint court orders &amp; court reports</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated/shared information systems</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint pre-hearing conferences</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of probation liaisons</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: The response category for these items was 1=None of the Time; 2=Rarely; 3=Some of the Time; 4=Most of the Time; 5=All of the Time)

As shown in this table, none of the promising approaches is used, on average, “most of the time” or “all of the time.” Five of thirteen approaches were used, on average, between “some of the time” and “most of the time.” Dedicated dockets/one judge approaches were used most often, followed by interagency meetings, multi-disciplinary teams, formal delinquency notification protocols, and continuity of counsel. The least often used approaches (i.e., mean < 2.50) were the use of joint court orders and court reports, integrated/shared information systems, joint pre-hearing conferences, and the use of probation liaisons.

As mentioned earlier, Petro (2007) conducted a phone survey with 71 administrators across the United States. He found similar results related to the use of promising approaches: 53% reported using assessment, 30% reported using approaches classified in Siegel and Lord’s (2004) Case Planning and Supervision category, 27% reported using special screening procedures for crossover youth, and only 11% used approaches that fell into Case Flow Management and Case Planning and Supervision categories. Taken together, these findings indicate that despite strong advocacy and support for collaborative efforts, large-scale, sustainable implementation of such approaches continues to challenge states and local jurisdictions.
In addition to the sporadic use of collaborative approaches, effectiveness of these approaches is an important consideration. With only one exception (Conger & Ross, 2006), none of the approaches described above has been evaluated to assess whether they meet their intended goals. Effectiveness of promising approaches ultimately plays a critical role in the attempt to shift organizations from an independent system approach to a multisystem approach. The absence of data may actually contribute to the slow growth of collaborative approaches since funds are increasingly directed at programs that are evidence-based or empirically proven to reach intended outcomes. Perhaps the most concerning finding is the virtual absence of discussions regarding outcomes for crossover youth. Wiig and Tuell (2004), Halemba et al. (2004), and Herz and Ryan (In Press) offer some guidance on this point, but to date, a comprehensive list of suggested outcomes does not exist. As a resource for future discussion, a list of outcomes developed by the Los Angeles Juvenile Court AB 129 Executive Committee is provided in Appendix D.

As research increasingly demonstrates, crossover youth face uncertain futures unless their needs are addressed as early as possible using a comprehensive approach.

Summary

In sum, at least four persistent themes surface from the information reviewed in this chapter. First, collaborative approaches are necessary to improve communication and coordination across agencies. Second, collaborative approaches are sporadic and guided more by local needs than an overarching philosophy and directive from research and policy groups. Consequently, there is great variation in the ways integration and collaboration are accomplished not only across states, but within states as well. Third, confusion over roles and responsibilities in collaborative approaches is a chronic problem that hinders the potential success of any approach undertaken by a jurisdiction. Finally, coordination efforts intended to improve information-sharing and coordinated case management depend heavily on integration efforts. Integration provides a larger infrastructure through which coordination can function and flourish. In other words, the day-to-day case management of a youth will only succeed if resources (i.e., integrated/shared information systems, blended funding, and access to a continuum of effective services and placements) are available.

Addressing these areas requires clear definitions of crossover youth and how they should be handled within a state. In a telephone survey, Petro (2006) found that only 51% of state respondents could identify a law, written policy, memorandum of understanding, or executive order outlining the expectations and procedure for processing crossover youth across the child welfare and juvenile justice systems. These results underscore the need to educate key stakeholders. Without recognition and clear understanding of the crossover problem, the likelihood of building effective multisystem approaches remains tenuous. Finally, the evaluation of promising approaches based on outcomes specific to crossover youth needs to be prioritized. The consequences of not addressing these issues are dramatic. As research increasingly demonstrates, crossover youth face uncertain futures unless their needs are addressed as early as possible using a comprehensive approach.
To further explore the experiences and perceptions of practitioners who oversee the handling of crossover youth on a daily basis, a national survey was sent to a sample of state administrators for child protective services, state administrators for juvenile probation, state administrators for juvenile institutional corrections, juvenile justice specialists, county administrators for child protective services, county administrators for probation, county administrators for juvenile corrections, and juvenile court judges. The survey was comprised primarily of close-ended questions; however, a few open-ended questions were used to capture respondents’ perceptions of their strengths in handling crossover youth as well as the problems they continued to face despite progress in this area.

Specifically, open-ended items on the survey asked respondents to identify (1) three strengths related to their current handling of crossover youth, (2) three of the most significant problems facing their state’s approach to handling crossover youth, (3) three primary areas that needed improvement in their state’s approach to handling crossover youth, and (4) three recommendations for improving the handling of crossover youth. The last three questions generated responses that were very similar in substance; thus, the responses were combined to create one category for challenges and problems that characterize the handling of crossover youth. Analysis of the open-ended items revealed several themes related to the handling of crossover youth. Table 4.1 summarizes and compares these results.

Table 4.1: Summary of Results for Strengths and Challenges/Problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Strengths (N=269)</th>
<th>Challenges/Problems (N=902)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration &amp; Consistency Across Agencies</td>
<td>228 83%</td>
<td>420 46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of Services</td>
<td>14 5%</td>
<td>258 28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>13 5%</td>
<td>93 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Placements &amp; Placement Alternatives</td>
<td>-- --</td>
<td>48 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention &amp; Early Intervention</td>
<td>-- --</td>
<td>46 5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: (1) The unit of analysis in this table is total number of responses rather than total number of respondents. (2) Categories associated with less than 5% of the responses were excluded from the table.

Please see Appendix A for a description of the procedures used in conducting the survey and for a summary of response rates.

Data analysis revealed group differences across respondent groups and between state and county respondents. Due to the limited space, results are shown for all respondents collectively. Statistically significant mean differences across respondent groups and/or between state and county respondents will be noted in the text when applicable.
As shown in this table, the most dominant theme from these data was the role of collaboration and consistency in handling crossover youth. Collaboration and consistency represent the willingness of various entities in the child welfare and juvenile justice systems to work together in order to improve the assessment of crossover youth and to provide them with more appropriate services. Interestingly, collaboration and consistency was cited most often as both a strength and a challenge/problem related to handling crossover youth. While at first these results may seem contradictory, they make a great deal of sense when considering the substantial obstacles that face multisystem approaches. In other words, these findings may reflect both the progress that agencies have made in the area of collaboration as well as their continued struggles with establishing clarity in roles and responsibilities, resolving agency conflicts, monitoring agency and staff accountability, and overcoming hurdles to collaborative funding arrangements. These seemingly mixed results are reflected elsewhere (Petro, 2007) and seem to capture jurisdictions’ continuous battle between the urgent need to respond differently to crossover youth and the slow progress made across agencies toward collaboration.

The remaining strengths pale in comparison to collaboration and consistency. Only 5% of the respondents indicated that access to appropriate services and access to funding were strengths in current methods for handling crossover youth. In contrast, access to appropriate services (general as well as behavioral health services) was viewed more as a challenge/problem (28%), rating it as the second highest challenge/problem facing the handling of crossover youth. Two additional challenges/problems were also related to the availability of services: the availability of appropriate placements and/or placement alternatives (5%) and the availability of prevention and early intervention services for youth in child protective services who are at-risk for crossing into delinquency (5%). Access to funding for services (10%) was the third highest challenge/problem faced by respondents.

Taken together, the responses presented in Table 4.1 draw attention to three principal concerns related to the handling of crossover youth: the ability to collaborate across systems, the ability to access appropriate services and placements, and the ability to access funding for appropriate services and placements. To better understand the nature of these themes and to consider how multisystem approaches might be improved, each of these themes is further explored using additional survey data.

**Use of Collaboration**

In Chapter 2, a wide range of collaborative approaches to handling crossover youth was reviewed and the use of promising approaches was assessed. The results showed that promising approaches were not commonly used. In addition to the use of collaborative approaches, respondents were asked to indicate their agreement with several statements related to the collaboration between different agencies/entities implicated in the handling of crossover youth; specifically, these statements captured the extent of partnership between CPS, probation, institutional corrections, the mental health care system, the substance abuse treatment system, and educational providers (i.e., schools). The first finding from this table is striking and parallels the findings from Table 4.2. While collaboration does exist, agreement for effective interagency collaboration did not exceed 40%. In other words, the majority of respondents did not “somewhat or strongly” believe that effective collaboration exists across any agencies (see Table 4.2).
According to respondents, collaboration was most likely to occur between CPS and probation (39.5%) and between CPS and institutional corrections (31.4%). About one quarter of respondents also agreed that collaboration occurred between the mental health care system and CPS (28.1%), probation (26.5%), and institutional corrections (25.9%); between the substance abuse treatment system and probation (28.1); and between educational providers and probation (24.1%). Of all partnerships, collaboration was reported to be the weakest between the substance abuse treatment system and CPS (22.2%); and the substance abuse treatment system and institutional corrections (21.6%); and between educational providers and CPS (22.2%), and educational providers and institutional corrections (21.1%).

Table 4.2: Perceived Levels of Collaboration across Systems (N=185)  
—Percentage Reporting “Somewhat or Strongly Agree”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPS &amp; Probation collaborate effectively</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPS &amp; Corrections collaborate effectively</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The MH system is partner with CPS</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The SA treatment system is partner with Probation</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The MH system is partner with Probation</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The MH system is partner with Institutional Corrections</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational providers are partners with Probation</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The SA treatment system is partner with CPS</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational providers are partners with Institutional Corrections</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The SA treatment system is partner with Institutional Corrections</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational providers are partners with CPS</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Means and significant mean differences across respondent group and by state and county respondents are reported in Appendix B and C, respectively.

Mean comparisons yielded several differences across respondent groups and between state and county respondents. Probation respondents were more likely to agree that collaboration occurred between probation and substance abuse treatment system than respondents from child protective services and institutional corrections. County respondents rated the collaboration between mental health care systems and probation and institutional corrections higher than state respondents. County respondents also rated educational providers’ collaboration with CPS, probation, and institutional corrections higher than state respondents.
These results align with historical contracting patterns as well as anecdotal information. CPS has historically relied on Medicaid to pay for treatment services. The requirements for services through Medicaid promote more alignment with the mental health care system than the substance abuse treatment system. Probation, in contrast, has historically focused on substance abuse problems and contracted more readily with substance abuse providers. As mental health problems have increased among juvenile offenders, both probation and institutional corrections have started to utilize Medicaid funding and to forge better relationships with mental health treatment providers. From an educational point of view, it is not surprising that the relationship between schools and probation was better rated than the relationships with other agencies. Probation often has offenders in school and as a result, has started putting probation officers in schools. Many have expressed, anecdotally, that schools view probation as a method to control a student’s behavior, since problem behaviors can result in violation of court orders. Social workers, on the other hand, typically work outside of the schools even though schools are required to fill the many educational needs of their clients. Institutional corrections staff also work outside of the school system, maintaining their own educational programs (sometimes coordinated with local districts) that are expected, but rarely do, transition seamlessly into the public school system upon a youth’s release back into the community.

### Barriers to Collaboration

The survey also asked respondents to rate the extent to which the lack of collaborative relationships operated as barriers to effectively handling crossover youth. Table 4.3 displays the percentage of respondents rating each item as a “significant or very significant” barrier. When the relationship with each agency is considered individually, a lack of relationship with schools is considered to be the most significant barrier followed closely by relationships with the mental health care and substance abuse treatment systems. Not surprisingly, schools’ resistance to sharing information was closely related to the lack of relationship with schools, reinforcing the notion that confidentiality of information poses a problem for interagency collaboration, particularly when the entity is not part of the juvenile court system (i.e., CPS, probation, or institutional corrections). Interagency collaboration was least likely to be viewed as a problem with CPS, probation, or institutional corrections.

Despite these ratings, less than 20% of respondents rated any of these relationships (or lack thereof) as “significant or very significant” barriers to effectively handling crossover youth. Collectively, these results mirror those from the open-ended items, which showed that respondents felt that progress in the area of collaboration was both a strength and a challenge for their state/county.
Table 4.3: Perceived Barriers to Effectively Handling Crossover Youth (N=185)  
Percentage Reporting “Significant or Very Significant”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of relationship with schools</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools resistance to share information</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of relationship with mental health care system</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of relationship with substance abuse treatment system</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of collaboration with CPS</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of collaboration with Probation</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of collaboration with Institutional Corrections</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Means and significant mean differences across respondent group and by state and county respondents are reported in Appendix B and C, respectively.

The only significant differences across respondent groups were for barriers related to schools and collaboration with the substance abuse treatment system. Probation was less likely than juvenile justice specialists, institutional corrections respondents, and judges to rate collaboration with schools as a significant barrier, and less likely than juvenile justice specialists to rate collaboration with the substance abuse treatment system as a significant barrier. CPS respondents were also less likely than juvenile justice specialists to rate a lack of relationship with schools as a significant barrier. Across county and state respondents, state respondents were more likely to rate all these barriers as more significant than county respondents. This finding is consistent with those reported for collaboration—county respondents perceive more collaboration and fewer obstacles than state respondents.

**Training**

The ability of agencies to cross-train their staff arguably impacts a system’s ability to accomplish effective collaboration. As indicated above, collaboration requires commitment, the development of clear policies, and consistent implementation of those policies. Without cross-training, it seems reasonable to believe that collaboration would be less effective. This may be due to the fact that those responsible for collaboration would not understand each others’ roles and responsibilities, and their capacity for resolving interagency conflicts would diminish.

To assess the extent of cross-training, respondents were asked to indicate their agreement with a series of items related to the availability and completion of cross-training by different decision-makers/personnel involved in the handling of crossover youth. Table 4.4 shows the percentage of respondents who “somewhat or strongly agreed” with each of the statements. While a third or less of respondents perceived that cross-training was available, a small minority of respondents (15% or less) agreed that cross-training was completed. Respondents believed cross-training was most
available for attorneys (32.4%), followed by judges (25.4%), social workers (22.7%), and probation officers (20.5%). Cross-training was least likely to be offered to institutional corrections staff (13%). With regard to completion, social workers (22.7%), probation officers (20.5%), and judges (15.1%) were most likely to complete the training, while respondents believed that institutional corrections staff (9.2%) and attorneys (8.6%) were the least likely groups to complete the training.

**Table 4.4: Cross-Training for Advocates, Decision-Makers, and Agency Personnel (N=185) Percentage Reporting “Somewhat Agree” or “Strongly Agree”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cross-discipline training is available for:</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attorneys</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social workers</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation officers</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional corrections staff</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cross-discipline training often completed by:</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social workers</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation officers</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional corrections staff</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorneys</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Means and significant mean differences across respondent group and by state and county respondents are reported in Appendix B and C, respectively.

No significant differences between state and county respondents were found; however, differences appeared across respondent groups. Judges were more likely to believe that cross-training was available and completed by attorneys and judges than CPS and institutional corrections respondents. Probation respondents were also more likely to perceive training as more available and completed by probation officers than CPS respondents.

**Access to Appropriate Services and Placements**

A second theme that surfaces from an analysis of these data is agency access to appropriate services and placements for crossover youth. A critical step in identifying which services and placements are appropriate is through the use of a standardized assessment to identify the youth’s risks and treatment needs. Once risks and treatment needs are assessed, best practice dictates that a coordinated case
plan should be developed across agencies responsible for supervising the youth’s risks and meeting the youth’s treatment needs. Thus, assessment and case planning are key features to a system’s ability to effectively handle crossover youth. Survey results provide insight into each of these issues as well as into the barriers that respondents perceive to hinder progress in this area.

**Assessment & Case Management**

Respondents were asked to indicate how often they believed standardized assessment and coordinated case management are accomplished in their systems. Table 4.5 shows the percentage of respondents who reported “most or all of the time” to survey items related to assessment and case management. At least three findings surface in Table 4.5. First, less than 50% of respondents felt that agencies used a standardized assessment and coordinated case management “most or all of the time.” When comparing assessment and case management, however, respondents were twice as likely to utilize a standardized assessment for risk of re-offending and for treatment needs (40% and 38.9%, respectively) than to create coordinated case management across agencies (18.9% and 14.6%, respectively). Coordinated case management was slightly less likely to occur regularly between CPS & institutional corrections.

**Table 4.5: Use of Standardized Assessment and Coordinated Case Management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Reporting “Most of the Time” or “All of the Time”</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standardized assessment for risk of re-offending</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized assessment for treatment needs</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinated case management across CPS &amp; Probation</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinated case management across CPS &amp; Institutional Corrections</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Means and significant mean differences across respondent groups and by state and county respondents are reported in Appendix B and C, respectively.

Although the results for assessment were more favorable than those for coordinated case planning, uncoordinated (29.2%), inconsistent (22.7%), and limited access to assessments (27.6%) were still considered to be “significant or very significant” barriers to effectively handling crossover youth (see Table 4.6). These results reflect the growing commitment of agencies to use standardized assessments, but emphasize the fact that agencies have not fully overcome this hurdle within or across agencies.
### Table 4.6: Perceived Barriers Related to Funding (N=185)  
Percentage Reporting “Significant” or “Very Significant”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uncoordinated assessments</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconsistent assessment</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited access to appropriate assessments</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Means and significant mean differences across respondent groups and by state and county respondents are reported in Appendix B and C, respectively.

Three significant differences were found across respondent groups for assessment. CPS respondents were less likely to report the use of a standardized assessment for risk of re-offending as compared to probation respondents. Also, CPS respondents were less likely to report the use of a standardized assessment for treatment needs relative to probation and institutional corrections respondents. There were no significant differences found across respondent groups for assessment barriers. Ironically, state respondents reported more frequent use of standardized assessments for risk and treatment needs than county respondents; yet, they also rated assessment barriers as more significant than county respondents.

### Services and Placements Used for Crossover Youth

Once assessment and case plans are developed, accessing services is the next step in addressing the needs of crossover youth. Table 4.7 summarizes the results for various types of services that are used by states/counties across the nation. Results indicate the percentage of respondents who reported using particular services “most or all of the time.” According to these results, individual mental health counseling (32.4%) and substance abuse treatment (27.0%) are used most often for crossover youth. About one-fifth of respondents also indicated using group counseling (21.6%), cognitive behavioral interventions (20.0%), and evidence-based programming generally (19.5%). Day treatment (16.2%) and Family Functional Therapy (15.1%) were used slightly less, and specialized services for crossover youth (8.1%) were the least likely type of services to be used “most or all of the time.”

... individual mental health counseling (32.4%) and substance abuse treatment (27.0%) are used most often for crossover youth.
Table 4.7: Use of Services for Crossover Youth (N=185)
Percentage Reporting “Most of the Time” or “All of the Time”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MH-Individualized counseling</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse treatment</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH-Group counseling</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive behavioral interventions</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence-based programming</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day treatment</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Family Therapy</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized services for crossover youth</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Means and significant mean differences across respondent groups and by state and county respondents are reported in Appendix B and C, respectively.

Results for placements are contained in Table 4.8. While crossover youth were most likely to be placed back in the home (34.6%), only a third of respondents indicated that this option was used “most or all of the time.” Group homes for delinquents and residential placements were half as likely to be used this often, but nonetheless, they represented the second highest category of placements to be used. Respondents rated foster care and correctional placements slightly lower at 17.3% and 16.2%, respectively. Thus, it appears that the entire continuum of out-of-home placements are used regularly to house crossover youth.

Table 4.8: Use of Placements for Crossover Youth (N=185)
Percentage Reporting “Most of the Time” or “All of the Time”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Placement</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group home--delinquents only</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential treatment center</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group home--mixed populations</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster care</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional placement</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Means and significant mean differences across respondent groups and by state and county respondents are reported in Appendix B and C, respectively.
Agencies’ inability to place crossover youth in appropriate services and placements continue to be barriers to effectively handling crossover youth (see Table 4.9). Slightly less than half of respondents rated access to appropriate mental health services and a lack of appropriate placements as “significant or very significant.” Similarly, 37.8% rated access to substance abuse services and 28.1% rated access to evidence-based programming as barriers.

Table 4.9: Perceived Barriers Related to Services and Placements (N=185)  
Percentage Reporting “Significant” or “Very Significant”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of access to appropriate mental health services</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of appropriate placements</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of access to appropriate substance abuse services</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of access to evidence-based programming</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Means and significant mean differences across respondent groups and by state and county respondents are reported in Appendix B and C, respectively.

The only difference found across respondent groups with regard to services used for crossover youth was for substance abuse treatment. Based on mean comparisons, substance abuse treatment was more likely to be used by probation than other respondent groups. This finding is consistent with the general findings related to collaboration described above. County and state respondents rated the use of services and placements similarly with only one exception. State respondents reported lower use of individualized mental health counseling. Additionally, access to mental health services, substance abuse services, and evidence-based programming were perceived as more significant barriers to the effective handling of crossover youth by state respondents (compared to county respondents).

Funding for Appropriate Services & Placements

Funding for services and placements for children in child protective services as well as delinquency has been challenging for decades. Consequently, states have increasingly relied on federal funding to augment funds available at the state and county levels. To assess the nature of funding in states/counties for crossover youth, respondents were asked to identify the primary funding streams their state/county used. A substantial amount of missing data existed for items related to funding, which is indicative of the lack of knowledge about funding sources, poor survey items, or both. Nonetheless, the results generated from these items gives some insight into the extent to which federal funds are used compared to state and county funds. Federal funds typically included Medicaid and Title IV-E funds, whereas state and county funds typically included general fund dollars. As shown in Table 4.10, 40% of respondents reported using federal funds, 36.2% reported using state funds, and 23.2% reported using county funds. It is important to note that these sources...
were rarely, if ever, used in isolation; rather, some combination of funds is typically blended together to cover costs.

Table 4.10: Perceived Barriers Related to Assessment (N=185)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding streams used:</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method for using funding streams:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blended funding</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braided funding</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee for service pool of funds</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While it is unlikely that these numbers accurately portray the percentage of funds drawn from each source, they are instructive. For example, they provide some initial evidence of a growing trend to rely more on federal funds than local funds. As such, funds are more likely to be managed according to strict rules related to which services and placements are covered, making funding less flexible to the actual needs of youth. Very few respondents indicated the use of a “fee for service” method, which allows for more flexible funding based on the needs of youth. The importance of this problem is reflected in respondent ratings of funding as a barrier to effectively handling crossover youth. Slightly less than half of respondents rated inflexibility of funding and a lack of funding as significant barriers, and slightly less than one-third considered their state’s/county’s reliance on managed care as a problem (see Table 4.11).

Table 4.11: Perceived Barriers Related to Funding (N=185)  
Percentage Reporting “Significant” or “Very Significant”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of funding</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflexibility of funding</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliance on managed care insurance</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results from Follow-Up Calls to States

Following the analysis of survey data, research staff contacted jurisdictions in nine states to ask additional questions related to collaboration and to services and placements available for crossover youth. Six of the nine respondents contacted participated in the follow-up phone interview. These respondents represented Arizona, Maryland, Minnesota, New York, North Carolina, and Virginia. With regard to collaboration, each of the respondents was asked to define interagency collaboration in their jurisdiction and identify the greatest challenge to achieving collaboration in that jurisdiction. With regard to services and placements, respondents were asked whether crossover youth required specialized services relative to non-crossover youth in their agencies, whether crossover youth had a higher demand for certain types of services, and what types of placements were needed to meet the needs of crossover youth. The results of the phone interviews are summarized below.

Collaboration

All respondents indicated that their jurisdiction used some level of collaboration in the processing of crossover youth. Collaboration efforts typically included the youth’s social worker, probation officer, a representative from mental health, and a school representative; however, the majority of respondents indicated that whoever is involved in the case is a potential partner in the collaboration (e.g., therapist, teacher). The strength of collaboration varied, with most respondents indicating that collaboration in their area was very good to excellent but that efforts in other areas ranged widely in their effectiveness. One respondent stressed the success of collaboration across three counties in his area. The success was evidenced by the group’s ability to secure additional grant funding to support their efforts.

In general, respondents stressed their successes but openly acknowledged that improvement was possible. Respondents believed that effective collaboration is dependent upon the people involved in the collaboration and the stability of relationships developed within the collaborative effort. High staff turnover was identified by several respondents as a major challenge to sustaining collaboration. Not having the “right” staff was also cited as an obstacle—“some people are more collaborative than others, and people need to continually work on developing those skills.” Additionally, unaligned goals and different philosophies/procedures across the child welfare and juvenile justice system were a significant source of frustration. Collaboration was most likely derailed when differences in philosophies/procedures were combined with staff unsupportive of collaboration. Confidentiality impacted the effectiveness of collaboration because it restricted the ability to access information across systems and to develop comprehensive case plans for dealing with the case. Confidentiality combined with “turf” boundaries was particularly difficult to overcome. Finally, leadership was viewed as instrumental to successful collaboration. One respondent, in particular, stressed the need for agencies to compromise and not take charge of the process simply because they were the largest and had the most resources. From the perspective of this respondent, collaboration worked because the participants in the collaboration were respectful of the strengths and needs of all agencies involved in the process.
Respondents believed that crossover youth did not need different services from non-crossover youth in their respective agencies, but they indicated that crossover youth required more attention than non-crossover youth because of the complexity of their cases. Permanency was viewed as a key feature of these cases; yet, it was also one of the most challenging aspects of these cases. Due to challenging family dynamics or the absence of family entirely, numerous placement changes were common among crossover youth. In turn, crossover youth are often sent farther away from their originating community because placement options become fewer and fewer for them. This was particularly the case in jurisdictions with a limited number of local services.

The demand for services combined with a high number of placement changes underscored the need for more services. Specifically, respondents felt there was a need for gender-specific programming, day centers, short-term and long-term treatment for mental health problems and/or substance abuse, therapeutic foster homes, educational assessment and services, transitional services and supports, mentors, and more community-based programs in general. One respondent also indicated that opportunities to intervene with crossover youth early in the process were missed as a result of ineffective strategies and a lack of services for dealing with chronic runaways and truants.

Although respondents felt that crossover youth did not require different services than non-crossover youth, they acknowledged that the needs of crossover youth were more complex and multi-faceted than non-crossover youth. Respondents viewed crossover youth as needing more case management and access to therapeutic living arrangements that are structured and intensively supervised. Consequently, respondents expressed a need for programs designed to simultaneously address mental health problems, substance abuse, and behavioral problems. Traditional mental health programs and residential placements (i.e., group homes, independent living programs) were often considered inappropriate for these youth because these programs did not address the behavior problems with enough structure and supervision. In addition to structure and supervision, respondents indicated that handling crossover youth consistently and listening to them (i.e., their needs and wants) was critical to achieving effective outcomes.

Taken together, these results reinforce and augment the findings from the survey. Respondents supported the notion that while much progress has been accomplished with regard to interagency collaboration, several significant obstacles continue to hinder the wide-scale and consistent use of collaborative approaches across jurisdictions. Thus, much can be learned from what has been accomplished as jurisdictions continue to move forward in this area. For services, a new continuum of services is not necessary for crossover youth, but their unique situations require special attention. These results stress the need to increase the overall availability of evidence-based programs and access to residential programs that combine techniques to change behavior problems while also addressing the behavioral health needs of crossover youth.
Summary

In sum, the findings presented in this chapter help us better understand the use of collaboration for handling crossover youth, agencies’ access to services and placements for crossover youth, and the use of funding across systems to access services and placements for crossover youth. With regard to collaboration, there is a need to clearly define collaboration within the context of handling crossover youth. This definition, in turn, should be accepted and applied across all agencies and entities involved in handling crossover youth; thus, creating consensus and clarity with regard to role and responsibility obligations across agencies/entities and within agencies/entities at the state and county levels. Once defined, the application of this collaboration must be explored to identify the mechanisms necessary for implementing collaboration uniformly, rather than sporadically, within and across states. These results also indicate that collaboration with educational providers and the substance abuse treatment system is less established than it is with other agencies. Since these two entities offer services that are critical to the needs of crossover youth (see Chapter 2 for a discussion of needs), it is necessary to identify and address the unique barriers that prevent effective collaboration with them. Finally, special attention to the role of preparing staff to implement collaboration is critical. A jurisdiction may have a theoretically strong plan for collaboration, but without the appropriate people to implement the plan, it remains effective only in a theoretical sense.

With regard to services and placements, agencies need to improve their use of standardized assessments to identify youth risks and needs and to enhance their ability to coordinate the development of comprehensive case plans tailored to the individual needs of crossover youth. This should be a priority in developing collaborative approaches since accessing appropriate services and identifying appropriate types of placements depend on the risk and treatment need levels of the youth. Although results indicated that standardized assessments are being used, systems still struggle with limited access to assessments, inconsistent assessments, and uncoordinated assessments. Ultimately, it is difficult to assess what types of services and placements are appropriate and should be available for crossover youth until regular, consistent assessment is achieved.

The general trends related to funding underscore the need to fully understand which funds are being used and how they are used to fund crossover services. Assuming the need for federal funding will continue, it is essential to examine how the rules associated with different streams of funding potentially (1) reduce the efficiency with which funds can be used and (2) limit the availability of appropriate programming and placement options for crossover youth. Once identified, ways to reduce barriers across federal funding streams and to maximize the use of state and local funds should be considered.

While the results showed a great deal of consistency across respondent groups and between state and county respondents, several significant differences were found. Such differences point to the varying perspectives that respondents have based on their roles and responsibilities by agency and/or by level of administration (i.e., a focus on policy v. a focus on practice). These findings further stress the need for cross-training across agencies and the need to make sure that both state and county administrators understand each other’s perspective in order to (1) correct inaccurate and contradictory perceptions, and (2) ensure that any decisions related to policy and practice incorporate both perspectives. Ultimately, inter- and intra-agency differences must be resolved in order to build effective multisystem approaches.
Chapter 5: Building Multisystem Approaches for Handling Crossover Youth

Crossover youth present complex backgrounds and problems that neither the dependency nor delinquency systems can address individually; thus, it is necessary that agencies work together to address their risks and needs simultaneously. At a minimum, this requires child welfare agencies, probation and institutional corrections (when applicable), the mental health care system, the substance abuse treatment system, and education to develop collaborative approaches that are effective and sustainable. As indicated in this report, however, accomplishing collaboration requires the development of system integration and agency coordination initiatives that are uniformly supported by key stakeholders at the federal, state, and county levels (Wiig & Tuell, 2004; Martinson, 1999).

Although accomplishing effective collaboration is challenging, the literature in this area proves that building multisystem approaches is feasible. These efforts, however, have been sporadic, largely informal, and often dependent on specific individuals committed to the issue. The problem, in turn, is a lack of a coordinated vision and plan to ensure collaboration occurs in a consistent and sustainable way.

As indicated earlier in this report, the purpose of this initiative is to create a unified vision and a strong set of policy recommendations for the increased use of multisystem approaches. To this end, we encourage key stakeholders to translate the report findings into implications for policy development at the federal, state, and county levels. Martinson (1999), for example, identified several factors at the federal level that foster service coordination. Specifically, federal efforts should document and communicate information about the benefits of coordination (i.e., provide examples of successful collaboration; provide support for coordination by offering technical assistance, guidance, and problem resolution to states and local jurisdictions; and help states overcome barriers to using funding more efficiently and effectively). The role of states in successfully coordinating services includes: providing high-level support for coordination; strengthening statewide coordinating committees; providing localities with technical assistance and problem resolution; promoting the integration of information systems; and providing resources to cross-train staff (Martinson, 1999). Finally, roles and responsibilities for administrators at the local or county level include: developing an understanding of objectives and operations of other programs; increasing joint planning among local agencies; introducing cross-training of staff; and documenting and evaluating coordination efforts.

Ragan (2003) also points out that strategies at all levels must have an administrative and an operational focus. Administrative strategies underpin a state and jurisdiction’s ability to accomplish system integration, and operational strategies facilitate coordination across and within agencies. From an administrative perspective, federal, state, and local agencies must prioritize the integration of information systems and funding streams, shared responsibility in the planning, management, and oversight of multisystem initiatives, and the development of a comprehensive continuum of services that are available and accessible to collaborative groups working with crossover youth (Ragan, 2003). From an operational standpoint, agencies must work together to integrate intake and assessment...
procedures, create and co-locate multi-disciplinary teams, and develop clear policies that clearly outline agency roles and responsibilities with regard to the development, coordination, and oversight of case plans (Ragan, 2003).

Using Martinson’s and Ragan’s frameworks in combination with the findings presented in this report, we believe it is possible to develop a plan for achieving a multisystem approach to handling crossover youth. Yet, no plan would be comprehensive without consideration of research. Building a research agenda into a strategic plan not only documents progress in implementing that strategy, but it can assess the effectiveness of efforts, hold responsible parties accountable, and help direct actions in the future.

In sum, crossover youth have become a hidden population because of the lack of coordination between the child welfare and juvenile justice systems; consequently, they significantly impact the resources of both systems and personally face dismal outcomes as they enter adulthood. Failing these youth carries substantial consequences for the youth themselves, families, communities, and the criminal and social services systems. Conversely, succeeding with these youth breeds hope, which is the key to a better future for everyone. The opportunity exists for systems to recognize the shortcomings of historical approaches and design better models for the future. It now rests in the hands of policy-makers, agency administrators, and agency staff to turn potential into reality. This report was intended to tell the story of who crossover youth are and their experiences in the child welfare and juvenile justice systems; hopefully, it has not only told this story but has also inspired the development of a sustainable multisystem approach to handling crossover youth in the near future.
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To explore the crossover issue from a practice perspective, surveys were distributed to several administrators and decision-maker groups who represented the child welfare and the juvenile justice system at both the state and county levels. At the state level, surveys were sent to child welfare administrators, probation administrators, institutional corrections administrators, and juvenile justice specialists. At the county level, surveys were sent to child welfare system directors, chief officers of probation departments, county administrators for institutional corrections, and judges.

A survey for both state and county respondents was developed; however, the surveys were nearly identical across (or for) both groups. The most significant difference between the two surveys was language that referenced “in your state” versus “in your county.” Survey items represented three domains: The structure of child welfare and juvenile justice systems, the prevalence of crossover youth, and system responses to crossover youth.

Respondents were invited to participate in the survey via email, and they subsequently completed the survey at www.surveymonkey.com. The sample of respondents was identified using a convenience sampling method. Email addresses were provided by various professional groups. Specifically, we received email address from the American Public Human Services Association, the American Probation and Parole Association, the Council of Juvenile Correctional Administrators, the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, and the Coalition for Juvenile Justice. These lists were generated to provide a wide representation of states and counties, but the lists did not necessarily cover/include the entire population of any one group. The email lists were split at the county and state level, so that appropriate surveys could be distributed. Using survey monkey (www.surveymonkey.com), an online version of the systems integration survey was then forwarded to each targeted respondent. The email included the following introduction to the project:

Hello. We are writing on behalf of the American Public Human Services Association, Casey Family Programs, and the Center for Juvenile Justice Reform at Georgetown University’s Public Policy Institute, to seek your involvement in a survey we are conducting addressing a key issue facing the juvenile justice and child welfare systems. There has been much conversation over the past three decades on the nexus between child abuse and neglect and juvenile delinquency. This correlation has been firmly established in the research – both in data demonstrating a crossover or dual jurisdiction phenomena, as well as in the research showing that maltreated children have a higher probability of entering the juvenile justice system. What has only recently been raised as an issue for serious consideration and action is what we can do that responds to this knowledge.

The following survey addresses the extent of this crossover as you experience it within your jurisdiction, the barriers you encounter in attempting to address the needs of this population (including through multisystem approaches), and the advances that you may have made in breaking down those barriers. The
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survey will be completed by representatives from the juvenile justice and child welfare fields, including both state and local officials. It is our hope that through the results of this survey we will be able to more fully explore ways that policies, practices, and cross-systems operations can be improved to better support you in your work in this area.

Thank you in advance for your assistance in this important undertaking.

Shay Bilchik, JD
Research Professor/Center Director
Center for Juvenile Justice Reform
Georgetown Public Policy Institute
Georgetown University

Anita Light
Director of NAPCWA
American Public Human Services Association

Respondents were provided the opportunity to decline the survey and be removed from the mailing list. All procedures and protocols were approved by the Institutional Review Board at the University of Illinois, Urbana–Champaign.

Respondents were given approximately three weeks to complete the survey. All data were then cleaned and prepared for analysis. Four open-ended questions were read by two researchers associated with the Children and Family Research Center at the University of Illinois, who, in turn, independently coded themes from the open field responses. The researchers then met, compared coding schemes, and created the final list of categories.

Once the results were analyzed, a small number of jurisdictions were selected for a follow-up phone interview. Phone interviews provided the opportunity to pursue more detailed responses in areas of interest identified in the survey responses. Ten states were contacted with regard to their methods for documenting the prevalence of crossover youth, including: California, Colorado, Connecticut, Idaho, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Washington. Additionally, nine states were contacted to discuss their responses to crossover youth, particularly with regard to collaboration, funding, and providing services included: Arizona, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New York, Ohio, North Carolina, Virginia, and Washington. The following questions were used in these phone interviews:

1. Once a youth in child protective services is charged with delinquency, how is he/she handled in your court system?
2. Ideally, how would you define interagency collaboration with regard to handling crossover youth? Who should be part of the collaboration? Would you say your area has good, formal collaboration based on this definition?

3. How would you characterize the current level of participation by all agencies involved in your collaborative approach?

4. What is the greatest challenge to achieving formal collaboration across agencies?

5. How are services for crossover youth primarily paid for?

6. Do you use blended, braided, or fee for service funding? If so, please describe how this works.

7. Do you think crossover youth need specialized services (i.e., different from youth only in the delinquency system or only under the care of child protective services)? If so, what type(s) of services?

8. Do you think crossover youth have a higher demand for certain types of services offered to youth only in one system or the other? If so, what types of services?

9. Availability of appropriate placements is often cited as a problem faced for crossover youth. What types of placements are needed, but often unavailable, for these youth?

Response Rate: 144 state representatives and 220 county representatives received an email inviting them to participate in the survey. 104 (73%) state representatives entered the survey site and 77 (53%) completed the survey. 141 (64%) county representatives entered the survey site and 107 (49%) completed the survey. In total, there are 182 survey respondents. A total of 47 states (including the District of Columbia) and one U.S. Territory were represented by state and/or county respondents. States/territories represented by type of respondent are summarized in Table 1.
Table 1: States/Territories Represented by Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State/Territory</th>
<th>Respondent Type</th>
<th>State/Territory</th>
<th>Respondent Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>■ ■</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>■ ■</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>■ ■</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>■ ■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia (D.C.)</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>■ ■</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>■ ■</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>■ ■</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>■ ■</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>■ ■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>■ ■</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>■ ■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>■ ■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>■ ■</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>American Samoa</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>■ ■</td>
<td>U.S. Virgin Islands</td>
<td>■ ■</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Respondent Positions:** Among state respondents, slightly more than a third (39.2%) were state administrators for institutional corrections, approximately one-quarter were state administrators for the child welfare system and juvenile justice specialists (27.0% and 25.7% respectively), and only 8.1% of respondents were state administrators for probation (see Table 2). Among county respondents, almost half (49.7%) were county administrators for child welfare, approximately one-quarter were county administrators for probation and juvenile court judges (26.2% and 22.4% respectively), and only 2.8% of respondents were county administrators for institutional corrections.
Table 2: Positions Currently Held by Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Currently Held</th>
<th>State (N=74)</th>
<th>County (N=107)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Survey Respondents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Administrator for Child Welfare System</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Administrator for Probation System</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Administrator for Juvenile Corrections</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Justice Specialist</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Respondents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Administrator for Child Welfare</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Administrator for Probation</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Administrator Juvenile Corrections</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Court Judge</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Results for Mean Comparison across Respondent Groups

Table 1: Perceived Level of Importance to Various Agencies/Policy-Making Bodies

(1=Not Important at all . . . 5=Extremely Important)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n Mean SD</td>
<td>n Mean SD</td>
<td>n Mean SD</td>
<td>n Mean SD</td>
<td>n Mean SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Welfare*</td>
<td>71 4.34 0.83</td>
<td>36 4.08 1.13</td>
<td>29 3.69 1.17</td>
<td>24 3.75 0.94</td>
<td>16 3.75 1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation</td>
<td>71 4.11 0.95</td>
<td>36 4.31 0.92</td>
<td>29 4.00 0.96</td>
<td>24 3.96 0.95</td>
<td>16 4.00 1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrections*</td>
<td>69 3.81 1.12</td>
<td>36 3.36 1.40</td>
<td>29 4.17 0.85</td>
<td>24 3.08 1.35</td>
<td>17 4.00 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>70 3.90 1.09</td>
<td>36 3.97 1.08</td>
<td>28 3.64 1.16</td>
<td>24 3.38 1.21</td>
<td>16 3.88 1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>69 3.39 1.11</td>
<td>36 3.42 1.30</td>
<td>28 3.39 1.26</td>
<td>23 3.00 1.28</td>
<td>16 3.38 1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>68 3.18 1.22</td>
<td>32 3.03 1.23</td>
<td>28 3.29 1.27</td>
<td>21 2.43 1.29</td>
<td>15 3.13 1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature</td>
<td>68 2.91 1.21</td>
<td>31 2.94 1.26</td>
<td>26 2.96 1.43</td>
<td>22 2.59 1.44</td>
<td>16 3.00 1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Governing Boards</td>
<td>66 3.23 1.05</td>
<td>31 2.87 1.23</td>
<td>25 2.80 1.22</td>
<td>22 2.68 1.17</td>
<td>14 3.00 1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personally</td>
<td>70 4.53 0.79</td>
<td>36 4.36 0.96</td>
<td>29 4.45 0.78</td>
<td>24 4.71 0.62</td>
<td>17 4.76 0.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Analysis of Variance results significant p<.05
Table 2: Methods Used for Handling Crossover Youth
(1=None of the Time; 2=Rarely; 3=Some of the Time; 4=Most of the Time; 5=All of the Time)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protocols for notifying CPS &amp; attorney upon delinquency*</td>
<td>55 3.20 1.38</td>
<td>28 3.75 1.32</td>
<td>20 2.65 1.46</td>
<td>17 4.06 1.25</td>
<td>11 2.64 1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured decision-making tools for processing*</td>
<td>55 2.68 1.50</td>
<td>28 2.39 1.55</td>
<td>19 2.53 1.31</td>
<td>17 3.53 1.59</td>
<td>11 2.09 1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated dockets/one judge approach</td>
<td>55 3.27 1.33</td>
<td>28 3.54 1.48</td>
<td>19 2.84 1.30</td>
<td>17 3.35 1.73</td>
<td>9 3.22 0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity of counsel</td>
<td>54 2.89 1.34</td>
<td>26 2.92 1.41</td>
<td>19 2.89 1.20</td>
<td>17 2.88 1.45</td>
<td>9 3.56 0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint pre-hearing conferences</td>
<td>53 2.28 1.13</td>
<td>26 2.00 1.02</td>
<td>18 2.44 0.92</td>
<td>17 2.76 1.52</td>
<td>9 2.00 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint court orders &amp; court reports</td>
<td>53 2.25 1.33</td>
<td>27 2.22 1.28</td>
<td>18 2.28 1.02</td>
<td>17 3.12 1.36</td>
<td>10 2.70 1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint case plans*</td>
<td>55 2.15 1.16</td>
<td>27 3.04 1.13</td>
<td>18 2.50 0.86</td>
<td>17 2.94 1.48</td>
<td>10 2.70 1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of MDT to assess and manage cases</td>
<td>55 3.29 1.13</td>
<td>28 3.43 0.96</td>
<td>18 3.06 0.73</td>
<td>17 3.29 1.45</td>
<td>9 2.56 1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of child protective service liaisons</td>
<td>53 2.21 1.41</td>
<td>28 2.50 1.35</td>
<td>18 2.28 1.07</td>
<td>16 2.63 1.50</td>
<td>8 2.63 1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of probation liaisons</td>
<td>53 1.98 1.15</td>
<td>27 2.33 1.33</td>
<td>18 1.78 0.81</td>
<td>16 2.56 1.46</td>
<td>8 2.00 0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated/shared information systems</td>
<td>55 1.71 1.20</td>
<td>29 2.07 1.39</td>
<td>20 2.15 1.09</td>
<td>17 2.12 1.54</td>
<td>10 2.60 1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority over parents/guardians in delinquency court</td>
<td>49 2.59 1.58</td>
<td>28 2.75 1.58</td>
<td>19 3.21 1.40</td>
<td>17 3.53 1.62</td>
<td>10 2.50 1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interagency planning meetings</td>
<td>55 3.42 1.05</td>
<td>29 3.52 0.95</td>
<td>21 2.95 0.86</td>
<td>17 3.47 1.46</td>
<td>10 2.70 1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding arrangements across CW &amp; Probation</td>
<td>55 2.87 1.30</td>
<td>29 2.97 1.21</td>
<td>19 2.58 0.61</td>
<td>16 2.63 1.50</td>
<td>10 2.50 1.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Analysis of Variance results significant at p<.05
Table 3: Perceived Barriers to Effectively Handling Crossover Youth
(1=Not Significant . . . 5=Very Significant)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inconsistent assessment*</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.91 1.17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.57 1.17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncoordinated assessments1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.05 1.11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.79 1.20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited access to appropriate assessments</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.02 1.13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.79 1.26</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of funding</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.87 1.20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.83 1.14</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflexibility of funding</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.83 1.12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.52 1.33</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliance on managed care insurance</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.08 1.34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.43 1.14</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistant partner agencies*</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.44 1.20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.64 1.10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of collaboration with CPS1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.22 1.13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.57 1.03</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of collaboration with Probation</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.36 1.18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.07 0.92</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of collaboration with Institutional Corrections</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.38 1.11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.04 1.06</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of relationship with mental health care system</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.42 1.17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.61 0.99</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of relationship with substance abuse treatment system</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.69 1.29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.18 0.94</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of relationship with schools*</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.60 0.99</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.04 1.10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools resistance to share information*</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2.41 1.17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.00 1.34</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to appropriate mental health services</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.51 1.15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.52 1.24</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to appropriate substance abuse services*</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.44 1.21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.90 1.23</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to evidence-based programming*</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.21 1.15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.89 1.25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of appropriate placements</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.73 1.34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.55 1.15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Analysis of Variance results significant at p<.05
Table 4: Perceived Levels of Collaboration across Systems
(1=Strongly Disagree; 2=Somewhat Disagree; 3=Neither Agree or Disagree; 4=Somewhat Agree; 5=Strongly Agree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n Mean     SD</td>
<td>n Mean     SD</td>
<td>n Mean     SD</td>
<td>n Mean     SD</td>
<td>n Mean     SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPS &amp; Probation collaborate effectively</td>
<td>55 3.42 1.13</td>
<td>29 3.48 1.18</td>
<td>21 2.67 1.15</td>
<td>17 3.35 1.32</td>
<td>13 3.31 1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPS &amp; Corrections collaborate effectively*</td>
<td>55 3.35 1.08</td>
<td>29 3.38 1.15</td>
<td>21 2.62 1.07</td>
<td>15 2.67 1.23</td>
<td>13 3.23 1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The MH system is partner with…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPS</td>
<td>55 3.07 1.32</td>
<td>28 3.18 0.94</td>
<td>20 2.55 0.89</td>
<td>17 2.82 1.33</td>
<td>13 2.92 1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation</td>
<td>55 3.00 1.19</td>
<td>29 3.17 1.20</td>
<td>21 2.33 1.20</td>
<td>17 3.00 1.37</td>
<td>13 3.00 1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Corrections</td>
<td>55 3.07 1.15</td>
<td>29 3.17 1.00</td>
<td>21 2.52 1.29</td>
<td>16 3.06 1.29</td>
<td>12 2.67 1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The SA treatment system is partner with…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPS</td>
<td>55 2.82 1.23</td>
<td>28 3.18 1.06</td>
<td>21 2.43 0.87</td>
<td>17 2.88 1.17</td>
<td>12 3.17 1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation*</td>
<td>55 2.82 1.12</td>
<td>29 3.59 1.12</td>
<td>21 2.57 1.12</td>
<td>17 2.94 1.20</td>
<td>12 3.17 1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Corrections*</td>
<td>55 2.73 1.08</td>
<td>29 3.21 0.98</td>
<td>21 2.67 1.15</td>
<td>16 2.81 1.28</td>
<td>12 3.08 1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational providers are partners with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPS</td>
<td>54 3.06 1.27</td>
<td>28 3.14 1.04</td>
<td>21 2.62 0.86</td>
<td>17 2.65 1.27</td>
<td>12 2.50 1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation*</td>
<td>55 3.09 1.09</td>
<td>29 3.34 1.45</td>
<td>21 2.52 1.08</td>
<td>17 2.65 1.17</td>
<td>12 2.42 1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Corrections*</td>
<td>55 2.98 1.13</td>
<td>29 3.31 1.20</td>
<td>21 2.71 1.23</td>
<td>16 2.75 1.06</td>
<td>12 2.17 1.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Analysis of Variance results significant at p<.05
Table 5: Perceived Levels of Cross-Training for Advocates, Decision-Makers, and Agency Personnel
(1=Strongly Disagree; 2=Somewhat Disagree; 3-Neither Agree or Disagree; 4=Somewhat Agree; 5=Strongly Agree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-discipline training available for:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorneys*</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges*</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation Officers*</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Workers</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Corrections Staff</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cross-discipline training often completed by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorneys*</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges*</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation Officers*</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Workers</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Corrections Staff</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Analysis of Variance results significant at p<.05

Table 6: Use of Standardized Assessment and Coordinated Case Management
(1=None of the Time; 2=Rarely; 3=Some of the Time; 4=Most of the Time; 5=All of the Time)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized assessment for risk of re-offending*</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized assessment for treatment needs*</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinated case management across CPS &amp; Probation</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinated case management across CPS &amp; Corrections</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Analysis of Variance results significant at p<.05
Table 7: Types of Services Used for Crossover Youth  
(1=None of the Time; 2=Rarely; 3=Some of the Time; 4=Most of the Time; 5=All of the Time)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized services for crossover youth</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized educational services for crossover youth</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-specialized services</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH-Individualized counseling</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH-Group counseling</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive behavioral interventions</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day treatment</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse treatment*</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Family Therapy</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence-based programming*</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster care</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group home–mixed populations</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group home–delinquents only</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential treatment center</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional placement</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Analysis of Variance results significant at p<.05
Appendix C: Results for Mean Comparisons across State and County Respondent

Table 1: Perceived Level of Importance to Various Agencies/Policy-Making Bodies
(1=Not Important at all . . . 5=Extremely Important)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Importance to…</th>
<th>State (N=75)</th>
<th>County (N=107)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Welfare</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrections*</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor*</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature*</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Governing Boards</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Items are rank ordered by county responses.
*T-test results significant at p<.05

Table 2: Methods Used for Handling Crossover Youth
(1=None of the Time; 2=Rarely; 3=Some of the Time; 4=Most of the Time; 5=All of the Time)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>State (N=75)</th>
<th>County (N=107)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal protocols for notifying CPS &amp; attorney*</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated dockets/one judge approach</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interagency planning meetings</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of MDT to assess and manage cases</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity of counsel</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative funding b/t CPS &amp; Probation</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured decision-making tools for processing</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority over parents/guardians in delinquency</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint case plans</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint court orders &amp; court reports</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of child protective service liaisons</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint pre-hearing conferences</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of probation liaisons</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated/shared information systems</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Items are rank ordered by county responses.
*T-test results significant at p<.05
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### Table 3: Perceived Barriers to Effectively Handling Crossover Youth
(1=Not Significant . . . 5=Very Significant)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>State (N=75)</th>
<th>Count (N=107)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n  Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to appropriate mental health services*</td>
<td>47  4.02</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflexibility of funding</td>
<td>45  3.89</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to appropriate substance abuse services*</td>
<td>47  3.85</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of appropriate placements</td>
<td>47  3.83</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncoordinated assessments*</td>
<td>47  3.74</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of funding</td>
<td>46  3.74</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Evidence-based programming*</td>
<td>45  3.58</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconsistent assessment*</td>
<td>46  3.43</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliance on managed care insurance</td>
<td>44  3.41</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited access to appropriate assessments*</td>
<td>46  3.39</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of relationship with schools*</td>
<td>45  3.38</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools resistance to share information*</td>
<td>45  3.36</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of relationship with substance abuse treatment system*</td>
<td>45  3.09</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of relationship with mental health care system*</td>
<td>45  3.07</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistant partner agencies</td>
<td>45  2.87</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of collaboration with CPS*</td>
<td>46  2.85</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of collaboration with Probation*</td>
<td>46  2.76</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of collaboration with Institutional Corrections*</td>
<td>45  2.67</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Items are rank ordered by state responses.
*T-test results significant at p<.05
Table 4: Perceived Levels of Collaboration across Systems
(1=Strongly Disagree; 2=Somewhat Disagree; 3=Neither Agree or Disagree; 4=Somewhat Agree; 5=Strongly Agree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>State (N=75)</th>
<th>County (N=107)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inter-Agency Collaboration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPS &amp; Probation collaborate effectively</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPS &amp; Corrections collaborate effectively</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collaboration with Mental Health Treatment System</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The MH system is partner with Probation*</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The MH system is partner with Institutional Corrections*</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The MH system is partner with CPS</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collaboration with the Substance Abuse Treatment System</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The SA treatment system is partner with Probation</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The SA treatment system is partner with CPS</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The SA treatment system is partner with Institutional Corrections</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collaboration with Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational providers are partners with CPS*</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational providers are partners with Probation*</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational providers are partners with Institutional Corrections*</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Items are rank ordered by county responses.
*T-test results significant at p<.05
Table 5: Perceived Levels of Cross-Training for Advocates, Decision-Makers, and Agency Personnel
(1=Strongly Disagree; 2=Somewhat Disagree; 3=Neither Agree or Disagree; 4=Somewhat Agree; 5=Strongly Agree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cross-Discipline Training is Available for...</th>
<th>State (N=75)</th>
<th>County (N=107)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation officers</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social workers</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional corrections staff</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorneys</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Discipline Training is Often Completed by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation officers</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social workers</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional corrections staff</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorneys</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Items are rank ordered within category by county responses.
*T-test results significant at p<.05

Table 6: Use of Standardized Assessment and Coordinated Case Management
(1=None of the Time; 2=Rarely; 3=Some of the Time; 4=Most of the Time; 5=All of the Time)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standardized Assessment</th>
<th>State (N=75)</th>
<th>County (N=107)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk of re-offending*</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment needs*</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinated Case Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Across CPS &amp; Probation</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Across CPS &amp; Institutional Corrections*</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Items are rank ordered within category by county responses.
*T-test results significant at p<.05
Table 7: Types of Services Use for Crossover Youth  
(1=None of the Time; 2=Rarely; 3=Some of the Time; 4=Most of the Time; 5=All of the Time)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>State (N=75)</th>
<th>County (N=107)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-specialized services</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized mental health counseling*</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse treatment</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group mental health counseling</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive behavioral interventions</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence-based programming</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Family Therapy</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day treatment</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized services for crossover youth</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Items are rank ordered by county responses.  
*T-test results significant at p<.05

Table 8: Types of Placements Used for Crossover Youth  
(1=None of the Time; 2=Rarely; 3=Some of the Time; 4=Most of the Time; 5=All of the Time)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Placement Type</th>
<th>State (N=75)</th>
<th>County (N=107)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster care</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional placement</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential treatment center</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group home--mixed populations</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group home--delinquents only</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Items are rank ordered by county responses.
Appendix D: Proposed Outcomes for Crossover Youth
(Developed by the Los Angeles County AB 129 Executive Committee)

Proposed Outcomes by Domain

Individual/Peer Related Outcomes
- Increase connections/investment in the community
- Reduce association with delinquent peers
- Increase association with pro-social peers
- Increase association with positive adult role models
- Decrease in the use of and days spent in inpatient hospitalization
- Decrease in the use of and days spent in juvenile hall
- Increase ability self-control and self-regulating behaviors
- Reduce dysfunctional behaviors (self-injurious)
- Reduce substance abuse
- Decrease mental health symptoms
- To reduce overall risk to reoffend
- Reduce social isolation
- Reduce pregnancies
- Reduce participation in risky sexual behaviors
- Improve ability to obtain and sustain employment
- Improve successful independent living and emancipation
- Improve participation and performance in treatment
- Improve attendance in treatment
- Improve behavior in treatment
- Decrease number of irregular treatment service changes
- Improve behavior in placement
- Decrease number of irregular placement changes
- Improve desistance from crime in adulthood
- Improve successful completion of probation conditions (incl. restitution, community service)

Family-Related Outcomes
- Improve contact with family
- Improve parent(s)/caretaker completion of treatment
- Reduce family conflict
- Improve family communication and support
- Increase overall stability of parent(s)/caregiver
- Decrease time to permanency

School-Related Outcomes
- Improve school performance
- Improve school attendance
• Increase exercising educational rights
• Increase completion of IEP (when needed)
• Decreased time to complete IEP
• Improvement in achieving IEP recommendations (i.e., follow-through on IEP recommendations)
• Improve educational transitional planning and follow-up
• Improve access to educational information
• Increase the use of appropriate educational planning
• Decrease the number of irregular school changes

**System-Related Outcomes**
• Improve access to appropriate services and placements for youths and families
• Increase the extent to which recommended services/placements were received
• Increase the use of lower levels of care when appropriate
• Reduce the number of offenses occurring in group homes (i.e., congregate care)
• Reduce time required to access recommended services/placements
• Increase in the capacity for services & placements
• Improve interagency communication and coordination
Clear evidence shows that abused and neglected youth in the child welfare system are at higher risk for subsequent involvement with the juvenile justice system. These children, disproportionately children of color, penetrate the delinquency system more deeply and have significantly poorer life prospects than most other youth. Coordinated and targeted work across multiple systems offers opportunities to keep youth out of the juvenile justice system, and to treat them more successfully when they do enter that system. The task is large, but hardly impossible.

From May 7-9 2008, a determined group of representatives from across a range of youth serving systems and from around the country, gathered at the Johnson Foundation’s Wingspread Conference Center (Wingspread) in Racine, Wisconsin to outline a policy agenda that can and will effect better outcomes for these children and their families.

The Sponsors: This effort is jointly sponsored by the American Public Human Services Association, Casey Family Programs, Georgetown University’s Center for Juvenile Justice Reform and The Johnson Foundation.
The Participants

Angela Arboleda, Director of Civil Rights and Criminal Justice Policy, National Council of La Raza

Karen Beye, Executive Director, Colorado Department of Human Services

Reggie Bicha, Secretary-Designee, Wisconsin Department of Children and Families

Shay Bilchik, Founder and Director, Center for Juvenile Justice Reform, Public Policy Institute, Georgetown University

Larry Brown, Consultant, former Executive Deputy Commissioner, New York State Office of Children and Family Services

Lesley Buchan, Program Director, County Services Department, National Association of Counties

Joyce Burrell, Deputy Commissioner, New York State Office of Children and Family Services, Division of Juvenile Justice and Opportunities for Youth

Zeinab Chahine, Managing Director for Strategic Consulting, Casey Family Programs, New York City

Marc Cherna, Director, Allegheny County Department of Human Services, Pennsylvania

Terry Cross, Founder and Executive Director, National Indian Child Welfare Association

Cari DeSantis, Secretary, Delaware Department of Services for Children, Youth & Their Families and President of the Board of Directors of the American Public Human Services Association

Barbara Duey, Supervising Attorney, Children’s Law Center of Los Angeles

Mary Fairchild, Senior Fellow, Cross Jurisdictional Initiative on Economic Success for Working Families, National Conference of State Legislatures

Jerry Friedman, Executive Director, American Public Human Services Association

Fran Gutterman, National consultant in organizational development, training and professional development

Marva Hammons, Managing Director for Strategic Consulting, Casey Family Programs, Seattle

Denise Herz, Professor, School of Criminal Justice and Criminalistics, California State University, Los Angeles

Nancy Gannon Hornberger, Executive Director, Coalition for Juvenile Justice

Brandy Hudson, family engagement expert and foster care alumna, Long Beach, California

Bruce Kamradt, Director, Milwaukee County Children’s Mental Health Services and Director, Wraparound Milwaukee

Janine Kern, Circuit Court Judge, South Dakota

Bruce Knutson, Director, Juvenile Court Services, Kind County Superior Court, Washington

Arlene Lee, Deputy Director, Center for Juvenile Justice Reform, Public Policy Institute, Georgetown University

Lyman Legters, Director, Seattle Field Office, Casey Family Programs
The Participants (Cont.)

**Anita Light**, Director, Children and Family Services Department, American Public Human Services Association, and Director, National Association of Public Child Welfare Administrators

**Edward Loughran**, Founder and Executive Director, Council of Juvenile Correctional Administrators

**Lorrie Lutz**, President, L3P Associates, LLC

**Thomas MacLellan**, Director, Justice and Public Safety Program, National Governors Association Center for Best Practices

**Erwin McEwen**, Director, Illinois Department of Children and Family Services

**John Mick Moore**, Assistant to the Superintendent for Interagency Relations, Puget Sound Educational Service District, King County, Washington

**Michael Nash**, Presiding Judge, Los Angeles Juvenile Court

**Joe Ryan**, Assistant Professor, School of Social Work, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

**David Sanders**, Executive Vice President, Systems Improvement, Casey Family Programs, Seattle

**Michael Sanders**, Consultant, Columbus, Ohio

**Jane Tewksbury**, Commissioner, Massachusetts Department of Youth Services

**Terence Thornberry**, Professor, Institute of Behavioral Science, University of Colorado, Boulder

**Cheryl Townsend**, Director, Department of Juvenile Justice, Clark County, Nevada


**Ray Wahl**, Juvenile Court Administrator, Utah Administrative Office of the Courts

**Carl Wicklund**, Executive Director, American Probation and Parole Association

**Janet Wiig**, Director, Juvenile Justice Division, Child Welfare League of America

Johnson Foundation Partners:

**Roger C. Dower**, President

**Lisa Piche**, Program Assistant

Wingspread Fellows:

**Renee Dodge**, University of Wisconsin-Green Bay

**Celia Segel**, Carleton College, Northfield, Minnesota
Setting the Context

The Sponsors:

Jerry Friedman, Executive Director of the American Public Human Services Association, began the conference by describing the historic opportunity Wingspread provided to say something of lasting value about crossover youth and their families. Friedman stated his belief that the conference provided a moment of respite in an atmosphere conducive to innovative thinking. He also reminded participants that ideas planted at previous Wingspread conferences have often lead to fundamental reform.

In his opening remarks, David Sanders, Executive Vice President of Casey Family Programs, underscored the fact that crossover youth and their families are currently poorly served in both the child welfare and juvenile justice systems, and that these youth and families deserve to receive a full continuum of services. He argued that strong leadership and a compelling issue are necessary for policy changes to address this discrepancy in available services.

In his introduction, Shay Bilchik, the Director of Georgetown University’s Center for Juvenile Justice Reform, presented the challenge to be undertaken by the Wingspread conferees: to outline a policy agenda necessary to advance the work of better integrating the child welfare, juvenile justice, and other youth serving systems in order to achieve better outcomes for youth and families. Bilchik explained that this agenda must address not only political will, but perceptual, structural and fiscal issues as well. He argued that while there is already some understanding of the challenges facing these youth and what they and their families need, there remains much to learn. He indicated that although some jurisdictions have managed to address crossover issues locally, this work has not advanced nationally and he hoped that the Wingspread conference would provide the opportunity to develop a policy agenda and, ultimately, to effect significant change across the country.
The Sessions:

The following are summaries of the presentations and discussions that took place at the Wingspread Conference. Handouts, slides and papers presented during the conference can be found in the Appendix that follows the Proceedings.

The Family and Youth Voice

Michael Sanders, Columbus, Ohio and Brandy Hudson, Long Beach, California

(See Appendix 1)

Michael Sanders, a long-time youth worker, and Brandy Hudson, an alumnus of both the foster care and juvenile justice systems, presented on the importance of meaningfully engaging families and youth in order to improve these systems. Messages about family inclusion are always most clearly delivered by the families and youth affected by these systems themselves. Hudson and Sanders described a family development approach, core values and strategies that are needed to better engage families, and offered a prescription for strengthening the juvenile justice and child welfare systems.

The Family Development Approach is defined as “…a process that prepares families to meet the challenges of family life through a coordinated, progressive series of activities and experiences that help them to become competent.”¹ This process is both a philosophy and a method for undertaking the work. While it is grounded in the basic social work constructs of valuing families and recognizing their strengths, its focus is on the development of skills and capacities rather than fixing specific problems. This approach espouses the key elements of strengths-based work by engaging families as resources, actively strengthening families and promoting family inclusion at every step.

The Family Development Approach uses Annie E. Casey’s Youth Engagement Strategy definition of “family engagement” to guide the work of child welfare and juvenile justice systems: “The process of intentional and meaningful involvement of families in the decision-making, policy development and reform efforts to improve outcomes of any system in which they are a part.”

The presenters touched on legal arguments and research findings, but, in the end, came back to the straight forward message “nothing about me without me” to summarize the charge to the group. The three bold steps to meaningful youth and family engagement will require that: 1) child welfare and juvenile justice systems broaden their thinking; 2) leaders and practitioners “walk their talk,” and; 3) leaders share their power.

¹ Adapted from the National Collaboration for Youth. See the Appendix for more details.
Dr. Terry Thornberry engaged the participants in a compelling conversation about the relationship between maltreatment and subsequent juvenile delinquency. Much has been learned about the long-term effects of abuse and neglect on delinquency based on extensive longitudinal research in the Rochester Youth Development Study. This research focused on the relationship between the timing and persistence of maltreatment and the risk of future delinquency. Thornberry addressed three important questions:

- **Is maltreatment a risk factor for juvenile delinquency?**
  
  Simply put, “measures of maltreatment are significantly related to adolescent delinquency but, most maltreated youth do not have official records and do not self-report delinquency.”

- **Does the developmental stage at which maltreatment happens matter?**
  
  “Maltreatment that occurs only in childhood [i.e., does not extend into adolescence] is not significantly related to adolescent delinquency and other problem behaviors…these findings suggest that developmental models that highlight the long-term consequences of early trauma may overestimate its impact and underestimate sources of resilience.”
  
  However, “…maltreatment that occurs during adolescence, whether initiated in childhood or in adolescence, is significantly related to later delinquency” (emphasis added). Its impact on delinquency and crime continues, at least into the early adult years. The fading effect associated with childhood maltreatment is not evident.”

- **Is the impact of maltreatment on delinquency causal?**
  
  Using a propensity model methodology, Thornberry was able to report two findings:
  
  - “Childhood-only maltreatment is not a cause of subsequent criminality.”
  - “Any adolescent maltreatment is causally linked to subsequent criminality, including serious and violent offending.”

The policy implications of these findings generated many comments and questions. One of the most consistent themes was a clear affirmation of Thornberry’s insistence that this research is in no way a call for decreasing or diluting services to younger victims of maltreatment. Services are needed not only to mitigate the numerous harmful effects of abuse and neglect, but also to resolve the maltreatment so that it does not persist into adolescence. The focus must be on broadening, not shifting, services. There was wide agreement that it is important not to abandon current investments and that a hard look at services available to maltreated adolescents is warranted.
Thornberry provided a note of caution, stating that though research on maltreatment identifies correlates to delinquency, care must be taken not to over generalize from these findings as this could potentially lead to discrimination against youth who suffer adolescent maltreatment. Most maltreated youth do not become delinquent, and policies and service orientation must not further victimize them. This fact points to the potential benefits in understanding the protective factors that exist among these non-delinquency youth.

Another theme that emerged repeatedly throughout the proceedings was the general agreement that, regardless of background, very few youth are prepared to live on their own at age 18. Increasingly, reference is made to the early and mid-twenties as the period of “emerging adulthood,” a newly hypothesized developmental stage that is characterized by the need for strong connections to caring adults for youth.
Believing that the Wingspread conversation needed a common starting point, the sponsors commissioned Drs. Denise Herz and Joe Ryan to prepare a paper focused on the prevalence and characteristics of crossover youth as well as system responses to this population. The working paper was distributed to and read by conference participants prior to their arrival at Wingspread. “Building Multisystems Approaches in Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice: Report Findings and Reflections” presented a detailed review of the current literature in the field. It also included analysis of the results of a national survey of representatives of state and local child welfare and juvenile justice agencies undertaken by the authors. The survey provided valuable original research on the perspectives of these individuals, their responses to these crossover youth, and the level and success of cross-systems collaboration. This important work highlights the connection between maltreatment and delinquency and framed the policy discussion at Wingspread. The paper is an important, original contribution to the field and can be found in its entirety as Section III of this document.

The survey demonstrated large variation in perspective and approach in understanding and dealing with the issue of crossover youth. The view of crossover youth appears to be highly influenced by one’s role and location. Policy makers and practitioners understandably see the world differently and there are few opportunities to discern common ground. State and county administrators, who work at different distances from families and youth, see different opportunities and barriers. Even among practitioners there is no consensus about the issue of crossover youth and the use of promising practices varies greatly.

Perhaps the most confounding issue arising from the survey is the seemingly contradictory finding regarding the role of collaboration between systems. Collaboration was identified as both the most significant strength of current efforts and the most significant barrier. Herz and Ryan posited that it is a strength in that its central role is recognized and valued, but it is a barrier in that it is rarely done well. This finding generated intense conversation among the participants.

Two themes emerged from the conversation about collaboration: leadership and vision. The first focused on the role and importance of a strong leader in advancing the issue of crossover youth. Several examples were offered, including leadership emerging from the courts, advocates, policy or program staff. In the end, participants agreed that champions for advancing the work could come from any sector. Participants also warned of becoming overly dependent on the personal leadership of one or two actors. The need to share power, that is, to find ways to define common ground and allow a variety of interested parties to participate meaningfully and genuinely, may well be the greatest challenge in advancing multidisciplinary work. Collaboration may begin by court order,
statute or executive mandate, but sustainable collaboration requires that all parties have a shared vision and a stake in the outcomes. This theme was revisited repeatedly throughout the conference and remains an important issue to consider when developing a policy initiative.

The paper analyzed the differences between sites reporting high and low levels of collaboration. High collaboration appeared to be associated with many processes, practices, and policies that are likely related to better outcomes for crossover youth. These include more frequent use of joint assessments and shared case management, higher levels of services, lower rates of placements, and less restrictive placements. Details of this analysis can be found in the paper that is included in its entirety as Section IV of this document. The need for more intensive services (not different services but those of longer duration and greater intensity), earlier intervention, and the development of stronger supports around community-based placements were identified as key elements of successful agencies.

The paper highlighted the many, but disparate, pieces of information that exist about children in child welfare and their subsequent involvement in the juvenile justice system. This echoed many of Dr. Thornberry’s findings and introduced additional risk factors related to the likelihood that a youth will crossover from the child welfare to juvenile justice system. In addition to maltreatment, especially maltreatment that extends into or begins in adolescence, issues of race and ethnicity, out-of-home placement (particularly group homes) and the stability of placements are important predictors of crossing over. Each of these can contribute to negative outcomes for crossover youth.

The paper also highlighted the issue of racial and ethnic disproportionality and the disparate treatment of youth of color. While many understand that children of color are disproportionately represented in both the child welfare and juvenile justice systems, the research presented by Herz and Ryan indicates that minority youth tend to be overrepresented in the crossover population at even higher levels than in the child welfare system. Disparate treatment of children of color, particularly those in group settings, yields higher and deeper penetration into the juvenile justice system.

Many studies suggest that youth who are placed in family-based settings rather than group homes generally achieve better outcomes. Adolescents in group homes are twice as likely to be arrested as those in family-based settings. Conversely, youth with more positive relationships with family foster care providers are have lower delinquency rates. There was discussion of the potential cause or causes behind these findings, including the conditions in group homes that may result in less tolerance by staff of adolescent behavior, suggesting a need for staff training. In addition, the contagion effects of placing lower-risk youth with higher-risk youth are evident.

The influence of schools was introduced into the conversation. The literature shows that school suspensions are related to subsequent delinquency, and youth with recent suspensions are more likely to have a subsequent delinquency petition. Conference attendees concluded that the role schools play in increasing or decreasing the risk of youth in foster care crossing over into delinquency is an area in need of further analysis. Youth retention in schools is a highly desirable outcome, but pressures on schools to demonstrate performance across the entire student body may provide disincentives to actively serve and retain these youth. Therefore, identifying common interests in outcomes for schools in dealing with this population is important.
Research shows that recent involvement with religious organizations decreases the risk of delinquency. Conference participants discussed the fact that the church is an additional institutional influence that may reduce crossing over.

From the conversation about the research presented, a document was produced outlining the values, beliefs and underlying philosophy that guide the policy agenda. The summary statements are noted below. A fuller treatment of this is included as Section I of this document.

**Summary of Values, Beliefs and Underlying Philosophy**

1. We believe that the purpose of child serving systems is to understand and meet children’s unique needs.

2. We believe that children belong in families.

3. We believe that the culture, race and ethnicity of children and their families must inform policy and practice.

4. We believe in the intentional and meaningful involvement of families and youth in policy and practice development of all service delivery and governance.

5. We believe that service development and utilization must be driven by a common set of outcomes, and informed by data and evidence.

6. We believe it is imperative that we build the knowledge base, skill development and the capacity of individuals doing the work and youth and families served by the system.

7. We believe all children and youth deserve equal protections and access to services regardless of jurisdiction.²

² This statement is intended to affirm the inclusion of Native American children in this discussion and to point to the need to address disproportionality and disparate outcomes among all populations.
Following the morning discussion of research findings and underlying values and beliefs informing our work, the afternoon was organized around the benefits and challenges of doing cross-systems work.

*What are the benefits of multi-systems work?*

**Bruce Knutson, King County, Washington**  
(See Appendix 4)

King County is a primarily urban and suburban county, with high average education levels and a strong economy. It has a long history of collaborative working relationships and serves as a reminder of the developmental nature of collaborative work over time. King County also has strong political leadership. The presentation outlined how early successes became models for building on and capturing dollars for reinvestment.

There are three benefits that King County can point to as a result of its collaborative effort: improved relationships, enhanced services and stakeholder support.

**Improved relationships across systems.** These improved relationships grew out of several efforts. The first step in improving cross-systems relationships was the formal specification of roles and expectations across systems, with strong leadership participation at regular intervals over a sustained period of time. Shared responsibility for cross over youth was born out of and developed through these relationships.

Expanding and enhancing information sharing across the systems was an integral part of improving these relationships and the outcomes for youth. A legal committee was formed with the charge of developing a legal guide to identify what information could be shared. Over the course of its work, the committee’s most important finding was that “…the barriers to information sharing and collaboration are primarily cultural, technological, and tactical, rather than legal.”

Finally, systems protocols were developed that detailed how juvenile justice and child welfare workers would work together with dual status youth. Cross-system training followed.

**Improved access to services and improved services.** System integration work brought the mental health and education systems into the collaborative. A task force, chaired by a representative from the mental health agency, identified gaps in service delivery and developed training in substance abuse services for all child welfare and juvenile justice workers. The task force increased access to and support of research-based information. In addition, PathNet, a program for court-involved and truant youth, was developed to guide at-risk youth into education and career opportunities.

Perhaps the most surprising outcome of this work has been the passage of a permanent increase in the local sales tax to support gaps in the system of care in the county.
Enhanced support from foundations and legislators. Broad support, a clear agenda and strategic investments showed savings and demonstrated competence. This strategy is a powerful attractor not only to foundations, but also to all levels of investors, including government.

What are the benefits of multi-systems work? (cont.)
Erwin McEwan, Illinois Department of Children and Family Services

This presentation focused on three areas of collaboration in which Illinois, a state administered system, experienced success related to its child welfare and juvenile justice systems. These areas of success included county level (pre-adjudication) detention efforts, state level (post-adjudication) juvenile justice placements, and transition issues for youth returning to communities.

While it is often suggested that the expected direction of learning is from the child welfare system to the juvenile justice system, there are many lessons to be applied from juvenile justice to child welfare. In some instances, the clinical experience and analytic rigor found in the juvenile justice system can teach child welfare some important lessons. Examples that were provided include the use of the Child and Adolescent Needs and Strengths (CANS) assessment tool and the use of the Adverse Child Experiences (ACE) tool with detention cases.

Qualitative differences in juvenile justice assessments in Illinois were noted. When done locally, these assessments were much more frequently linked to the provision of community-based mental health services. They were also linked to far higher rates of service utilization and reductions in placement rates.

Finally, the presentation touched on efforts in Illinois to maximize the use of federal Title IV-E dollars through a waiver demonstration program to preserve candidacy for foster care youth while the youth are in juvenile justice placements.

In Illinois, the benefits of collaboration offer opportunities to:

- Share knowledge from using the same assessment tools, the same methods and the same service modalities;
- Learn how to address family issues in juvenile justice; and
- Maximize federal funding in both child welfare and juvenile justice.
What are the benefits of multi-systems work? (cont.)

Jane Tewksbury, Massachusetts Department of Youth Services

(See Appendix 5)

Jane Tewksbury detailed the work in Massachusetts with crossover youth and the effort to return the juvenile justice system to its previous, nationally recognized model. This change is facilitated by the fact that the Youth Services Department is in the Health and Human Services agency, so its family and community focus is rightly aligned with its parent agency. The question was raised about how deeply a model of practice has to be embedded to protect it from changes in administration. This issue was returned to in the discussion.

The conversation centered on the tremendous benefits that juvenile justice accrues from leveraging the expertise of other systems (e.g., behavioral health and substance abuse). Strategic investments can be made, but jurisdictions should search for existing expertise first. Tewksbury cautioned that because experimentation is both slow and expensive, it might be most efficient to implement best practices only after they’ve been validated with the specific populations one intends to use the intervention with.

Closing comments included a warning about placing low risk, high need youth in juvenile facilities or jails. It may be better to have youth placed in child welfare congregate facilities, despite concerns that some may have about these placements. In Tewksbury’s opinion, these placements may be preferable, despite their flaws, to placements in juvenile justice facilities/prisons that are the alternatives. Again, the themes of disproportionality and connections to community-based services arose.

New themes emerged from the discussion that centered on the practice of charging youth who act out in foster care placement with delinquency. Many suggested that this practice is inappropriate and reflective of a sometimes-ambivalent attitude within child welfare about working with very difficult youth and their families. Some also suggested that respite might be an answer for overwhelmed families, both birth and foster-adoptive families.

A shared observation was that jurisdictions often do not want to be the first to try new initiatives. Attendees recognized that experimentation is both time consuming and expensive.

The discussion continued with one attendee cautioning participants about the importance of collecting good data. Many programs survive precisely because they have maintained good statistics in order to show outcomes and to advance the knowledge base of the field. Wraparound Milwaukee was noted as an example of a program that has effectively used data to demonstrate successes.

There was discussion about the merits of evidence-based and evidence-informed practice. There is danger in relying only on evidence-based programming as this limits innovation, especially at the community level, and can put programs at risk that appear to be successful or have been successful for a long time but are based on small populations. This may be especially dangerous for culturally based programming in communities (e.g., Native American traditional therapies). A commitment
to collecting “practice-based evidence” may be a useful strategy.

Comments on the use of the ACE tool generated discussion around the desperate need for trauma-informed services. The literature and feedback from teachers, even at the elementary school level, underscore the pervasiveness of the issue. Professionals in schools and agencies need guidance and direction in dealing with the effects of trauma on children and youth, whether as a result of child abuse, exposure to domestic violence, gun violence, and/or a host of other experiences. From a policy perspective, the importance of involving the community, both as a partner and as a focus of intervention, is evident in order to improve the environmental conditions that result in trauma.

The Annie E. Casey Foundation’s Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI) received a lot of attention from participants as an important reform approach. The policy lessons learned from implementation include the effectiveness of JDAI in educating and presenting a model, with fidelity. In some jurisdictions, legislators speak at length about what JDAI is and what it does. This is a marketing lesson learned, and underscores the need for clearly articulated principles that are constantly referred to in the process of managing system change. Another important lesson seems to be that the eight strategies required by the JDAI model allow each community to fit the model to their needs.

One of the topics of discussion participants repeatedly returned to is the importance of strategic partnerships. It is perhaps the intimacy and familiarity of regular face-to-face contact that generates a willingness to find solutions; these relationships need regular nurturing. While the formation of these partnerships may be based in personality, they must be made broader and deeper to be of lasting value.

The inherent tension involved in specifying a reform initiative in statute was discussed. There seemed to be general agreement that much benefit can derive from general statutory language, but that difficulties ensue when legislation is used to specify a particular model. The lesson seems to be that the approach, the purpose and the values associated with the reform effort are what should be codified. For example, to support, invest in, and encourage family work in the juvenile justice system, what should be codified is language that supports child well being outcomes and community-based programming. Too much specificity in statute may have unintended negative consequences and limit flexibility.

Finally, the issue of using capital construction and facilities themselves as economic development tools was raised. In order to reduce resistance to alternative investments and to garner support for capturing and reinvesting savings from facility closings, new strategies should be developed to demonstrate the economic impact of community-based services. Important points to emphasize in such strategies include the fact that community-based services not only improve communities’ well being, but are also economic engines both through payroll and improved economic circumstances for healthier families.
The foremost factor in the success of Wraparound Milwaukee is collaboration across systems. However, the real key to success for a cross systems program may be who represents those systems at the table. In the case of Wraparound Milwaukee, administrators from mental health, child welfare, and the juvenile court all have seats at the table, and continue to come to that table routinely. This speaks not only to the importance of which systems are involved in the collaboration, but also to the level of authority held by each system’s representatives.

The barriers to multi-system collaboration were detailed, including the most troublesome philosophical, structural and funding issues that often plague collaboration. The cultural differences across agencies, the way in which services are delivered – and to whom – and the complexities of funding strategies in individual service silos were described.

Wraparound Milwaukee has developed successful strategies over time, and many of these strategies are possible with willing partners, perseverance and long-term commitment. These strategies include creating flexible court orders, preserving treatment options, and capturing and re-directing institutional-based expenditures to community-based care. Simplifying processes and integrating service providers were also often referenced, both of which are also reflected in the success of other sites that have improved outcomes without increasing expenditures (e.g., Allegheny County, Pennsylvania and Mecklenberg County, North Carolina).

As a part of the barriers presentation, Janet Wiig provided an overview of barriers related to information sharing. Perhaps the most important concept mentioned, and one that participants came back to over and over again, is that if parties are not crystal clear in their understanding of WHY they need particular data, they will at some point find themselves stuck on that issue and will almost certainly have to return to that question and do the developmental work before moving on. Once this issue is satisfactorily resolved, moving forward becomes much easier.
Often, prohibitions to data sharing are thought to be grounded in the law. In fact, there are many other reasons why data are not shared. These reasons include:

- **Lack of knowledge.** Agencies are often confused and will not share data, believing they are not permitted to do so. They may not understand the value of using the data for the benefit of the youth, and do not know which questions to ask. Often, staff members do not know if they have the authority to share data or whether the person they’re asking permission from has the authority to grant the request.

- **Different values and goals/different priorities.** Systems rarely talk the same language and often operate with different priorities. For example, if juvenile justice workers are trying to hold youth accountable, they may be prepared to share a large amount of information. If child welfare workers see themselves as protecting youth from more restrictive placement settings, they may be more reluctant to share data. Alternately, child welfare may be only too willing to share information if they’re trying to move a difficult youth to another system. Mental health may be predisposed to get as much information as possible, but protective about sharing it to reduce potential stigma to the youth. Defenders and children’s attorneys may be concerned about data sharing leading to the discovery of negative information that may prejudice the court against their client prospectively.

- **Variations in the complexity of record keeping.** The absence of data fields precludes sharing of complete data. Multiple files and multiple locations of data yield multiple opportunities for error.

- **Incompatible technology.** Many information systems cannot interface. Different formats, the absence of automation and other technical reasons may preclude data sharing.

- **Absence of will.** Individuals may believe sharing data creates more work for them or requires too much effort for the potential return.

Ultimately, system coordination and system integration are nearly impossible if the information sharing issue is not resolved. Case management, effective case planning and joint work across systems depend on the availability of appropriate data.

There was discussion about points of opportunity for collaborating around data, which include:

- **Inventory the decision points where data are being collected, who is collecting it, and where it is recorded and stored.**
- **Consider whether there is too much information being collected or reported and work toward an appropriate balance between transparency and protection of confidentiality.** Pay close attention to posting data on websites, given how deeply mined and archived these data can be.
- **Protect parents by asking them to review information and provide them with the opportunity to correct the record.**
- **Be clear about the circumstances under which the use of information-sharing tools and protocols is appropriate.**
- **Identify and use existing helpful tools to guide the formation of questions about data sharing, including how to insulate the use or re-use of information.** Additional helpful tools to consider include training curricula, tool kits, and especially the Models for Change initiative through the MacArthur Foundation.
The importance of data was discussed both in the aggregate (that is, system-level data) and at the individual case level. While the focus is often on aggregate outcome data, that information usually comes from case level data in the first instance. An argument was advanced that case level data needs the protection of a clear “information life-cycle,” meaning agreement on what is collected, how it is secured and confidentiality protected, and, finally, the method for disposal of the data.

There was an extended discussion about the need for a communication strategy that could speak to multiple constituencies. It needs to address motive and intent (e.g., a legislator’s interest in economic development) and be sensitive to public opinion (e.g., are “sentencing guidelines” able to compete with “mandatory minimums”?). It also needs to leverage public protection arguments and turn them into arguments for treatment options.

One participant commented that there are three variables to consider when thinking about programs: cost, time and quality. Unfortunately, the political focus is mostly on cost and time (i.e., cheaper and faster). The often missing metric is quality. Addressing quality is ultimately about sustainability.

Two final notes on data sharing were offered. It is important to remember that staff at the line level is often the source of the needed information, and there are critical capacity issues among line staff. And, it is important to capture case and aggregate data on race and ethnicity as these data will drive the work on disproportionality.
Examples of systems that work: Themes of leadership, tenure and tenacity

Cari DeSantis, Delaware Department of Services for Children, Youth & Families

(See Appendix 8)

Cari DeSantis spoke about Delaware, a state administered system, as an example of system integration work that has improved over time, with purposeful nurturing. She provided several important policy and operational notions that proved of interest to the conference attendees.

One of the keys to success in Delaware was an early recognition that embedding change into systems at large is essential to sustainability. The work in Delaware began early in the current administration, with an understanding, even from the start, that leaders had only a limited time to effect change. That sharp focus has been maintained throughout the past eight years, with stable leadership during that time.

Another key factor that was repeated several times during the conference was the advantage of having many of the child serving systems under the umbrella of one agency. In Delaware, the language of the enabling legislation creating the unified agency proved to be enormously helpful. It is an example of a specific policy direction, rooted in statute, which guides and directs subsequent reform. The agency charter requires comprehensive and unified services within a continuum of care. It requires work with families, services to children in the least restrictive environment, and an emphasis on preventive services to avoid placement costs and to promote family stability. That mandate remains a powerful spur to reform and continuous improvement, but still leaves much room for flexibility.

A singular focus on mission and vision has sustained the agency’s attention. Early branding of the effort, with constant repetition of its theme and values, aligns the work of the entire workforce. The mandate to “Think of the CHILD first!” is ubiquitous.

It was noted that empty sloganeering must not substitute for real change; the work in Delaware, however, was, and remains, carefully guided by the agency mission and values. A focus on crossover youth yielded integrated and coordinated service planning. An important accomplishment was the negotiation of a no-reject, no-eject contract with private agency providers. That outcome speaks to a highly collaborative model.

Partnerships extend beyond providers and include the courts, helped by the JDAI model, school districts, mental health providers and other stakeholders. Families and youth are mandatory partners in Delaware’s system of care work.

Several lessons are evident from the presentation about Delaware. The importance of message and repetition of the message, the need to mobilize and harness the work of the entire agency (including second tier managers), and the importance of genuine collaboration with partners, public and private, were all recognized.
Examples of systems that work: Themes of leadership, tenure and tenacity (cont.)

Judge Michael Nash, Los Angeles Juvenile Court

(See Appendix 9)

California is a county administered state. Beginning in the early 1990s and remaining in force until 1997, the system required that probation and children’s services conduct a joint assessment and then make a joint recommendation to the court regarding which status - dependency or delinquency - met the best interests of the youth. Though the system remained in principle, the practice around it was weak. While much information was included in the assessments, no real evaluation of the information was undertaken on a regular basis. The model was not well implemented and yielded a fairly high likelihood of deeper penetration into the juvenile justice system for dependency youth. In practice, there was still little communication and “system dumping” was evident.

In 1997, new screening processes were introduced in Los Angeles which led to a substantial improvement in the rate of youth receiving a recommendation for the status of delinquency. Only 25-30% of youth received this recommendation and many stayed in the dependency system with informal probation. Though this was a great improvement, the danger was that the informal probation arrangement provided a great deal of information to the delinquency side, and subsequent, deeper penetration remained a concern.3

Once in the delinquency system, the connection for the youth to the dependency system was lost and no mechanism to return to dependency status existed. Consequently, crossover youth lost their ability to return home, their caseworker, and access to their judge. Their attorney, a child welfare advocate, was replaced by a public defender. Adding insult to injury, services lapsed as well. It was clear that preventing crossover was an important goal.

A new law in 2005 allowed local experimentation with formal jurisdiction of both courts as a dispositional alternative. If counties opted to do this, the law mandated the inclusion of the Director of Children and Family Services, the Chief Probation Officer and the Presiding Judge of the Juvenile Courts on the planning team. Only eight of California’s 58 counties have opted in at this point.

Unlike the previous system, this alternative provides the opportunity to maintain a continuity of services and to develop enhanced agency collaboration. The foremost benefit has been shortened lengths of stays in juvenile justice placements. Once the community’s need for accountability was satisfied, the dependency system could remain involved with these youths.

This work began with the development of a comprehensive assessment based on strengths, needs and community risk. A Multi-Disciplinary Team (MDT) was created to do these assessments and had representation from multiple systems. The MDT served as the case manager for the case. The use of the MDT yielded better and more coordinated case plans.

3 This deeper penetration of the juvenile justice system could also increase disproportionality concerns.
Forming appropriate Multi-Disciplinary teams often proved to be challenging. Those working in Los Angeles County found that one of the most important ingredients of a successful team is the regularity of team meetings. Frequent and regularly scheduled meetings provide a place to discuss and solve difficult problems or issues with well established and known partners as they arise. This theme was referenced repeatedly throughout the conference.

This collaborative work is yielding important results. The system is serving youth better and services are more readily accessed or continued, with far fewer youth being recommended for transfer to the delinquency system. As importantly, there are positive and significant benefits accruing to the systems as well. This collaborative work is providing important information about the child welfare system and identifying gaps in services and areas in need of improvement (e.g., why aren’t substance abuse services being provided to youth while in the dependency system?). It is also yielding important lessons for the juvenile justice system about how to better serve youth entering the delinquency system.

The presentation generated extensive discussion. The conversation centered on whether reform efforts of this type to bring about more multi-systems collaboration require a policy mandate or whether policy permission would suffice. Permissive policies attract early adopters, and while these enthusiasts move quickly to implement change, bringing that change to scale is a major hurdle. On the other hand, mandates are sometimes grudgingly executed, with wide variation in how policies are implemented. Permissive policies may lend themselves to experimentation and hypothesis testing while mandates may require strong quality assurance mechanisms.

This theme was further explored in regard to whether integration of systems of care should be mandated or encouraged. Many examples exist where highly integrated systems of care are successful (e.g., Milwaukee and Allegheny County, Pennsylvania), but there is frustration about why these models are not more routinely adopted. In the end, political will and leadership are required when the policy context is permissive. But the question remains whether a mandate can substitute for the emergence of one or more local champions.

Leadership is always essential in turning policy into practice. However, even though the leader is likely to be fundamental in beginning the change process, there is a need to include sufficient involvement from others, internally and externally, from the very beginning of the reform effort. Without the involvement of others within the agency, and often partners outside the agency, it is difficult to embed reforms deeply enough to allow them to survive a change in leadership. Lessons of sustainability from the corporate world may serve as models for human services. Organizational change takes time and requires a sense of urgency, a clear vision, constant communication and a willingness to engage partners. If built collaboratively and carefully, this organizational change is more likely to become self-reinforcing and will be less easily dismantled.
At the end of the session, Lorrie Lutz, the facilitator, asked the conferees to talk about the policy areas that seemed to be emerging from the discussions. The topics fell into the general categories of policy development considerations, effective practice models, building strategic partnerships, and the importance of leadership and communication. The overarching issue of disproportionality was also identified as a theme. The key policy areas, grouped in the four categories just described, are listed below.

**Policy Development Considerations**

- Codification issue (that is, how to embed without overly specifying).
- Permissive vs. prescriptive policies, and understanding when to use which.
- Privacy protections (early on, and to protect re-disclosure).
- Using data for decision-making; outcomes.
- Embed sustainability (codification and integration may be parts of this).
- Public safety can be served by providing services to youth and families.

**Effective Practice Models**

- Practice model (the need for). Several elements of effective practice models also surfaced:
  - One judge/one worker/one attorney.
  - Integrated assessments.
  - Strengths-based work.
- Gender and culturally responsive services.
- Service availability and appropriate services.
- Transparency.

**Building Strategic Partnerships**

- Building together, slowly. Successful partnerships are often based on incremental steps, moving towards a pre-defined objective.
- Sharing power responsibly.
- Horizontal diffusion; lateral communication.

**Importance of Leadership and Communication**

- Organization integration or integrated leadership.
- Understanding that improved outcomes are likely to be modest initially; don’t be paralyzed looking for the “change the world” solution. (e.g., small change in residential placements yields large reinvestment dollars).
As a poignant reminder of why the attendees were at Wingspread, the morning session opened with a short video vignette about the story of a young transgendered youth whose life was fundamentally changed for the better only after finally being listened to and heard by the caseworker. After the video, one conference participant offered a personal testimony about a crossover youth who had suffered persistent abuse as a child and adolescent, and who ended up in the delinquency system. She struggled against the system and was drawn deeper and deeper into it. She resolved her situation by committing suicide. This conference participant stated that his practice would be different today in dealing with such a youth, and that the youth’s legacy was a constant prod to advance this important work.

The Policy Discussion: Implications of the research and practice issues lay the basis for a policy agenda at the federal, state, tribal and local levels.

Judge Janine Kern, South Dakota
(See Appendix 10.1 and 10.2)

Despite advancements on the program side, for example, moving toward systems of care delivery models, and extending mandatory school attendance to age 18, South Dakota lacked some basic policies necessary to better integrate systems and improve outcomes for youth. When Judge Kern solicited interest from other agencies to work on record sharing, she was met with hostility. It was only due to federal mandates [Section 223(a)(26) of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 2002] that she was able to bootstrap the initiation of this work.

Efforts began with the establishment of a records committee. After nearly a year of work, the effort was shared with the courts, which led to a strong and negative reaction on the part of defense counsel. The lesson learned was that the inclusion of these partners was necessary from the beginning. Failure to involve all key partners in the early stages of policy/practice development often results in the need to go back and begin the process anew. Operationally, it may seem like it takes too much time to include these partners and reach consensus, but the time spent up front, to bring the right stakeholders to the table, is a good investment which pays dividends in the long run.

South Dakota found that using an outside facilitator was helpful when the group reached impasses over difficult and complex issues. Technical assistance from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention and John Tuell, a facilitator from the Child Welfare League of America, were instrumental in breaking the logjam. The facilitator’s deep program knowledge, combined with the prestige of the national organization enabled South Dakota to move the process forward. Tuell helped to create an action plan, and South Dakota had a statute within a year.
Passing new legislation was an enormous success, but it represented only the beginning of a continuing process. The intent is to continue to keep the stakeholders at the table, and to work collaboratively on implementation issues. To underscore the sense of urgency, Kern quietly, but powerfully recounted the case details of three crossover youth currently in her court. Collectively, these youth spent 24 years in foster care, and all three are now in prison. “This is our challenge. If you need an impetus to start this work, here it is.”

Kern’s message closed with a plea to participants to educate judges, include judges in the process and use the federal mandates that exist to start the work.

The Policy Discussion: Implications of the research and practice issues lay the basis for a policy agenda at the federal, state, tribal and local levels. (cont.)

John Tuell, Child Welfare League of America

(See Appendix 11.1 and 11.2)

John Tuell provided a brief overview of recent and pending federal actions and provided some examples of system collaboration from a variety of states. This included examples of different ways in which comprehensive and/or integrated services are being supported. Among the examples cited is the work in South Dakota, described above.

Los Angeles was identified as a model worth examining regarding how to successfully codify principles of assessment. Another example to consider is Colorado’s HB1451, which produced a uniform system of case management. This legislation provides a good general framework without prescription. The language contained in the Memorandum of Understanding that Colorado used in this process outlines the general content required, but leaves a great deal of flexibility to counties.

Pennsylvania’s Act 148 created an incentive that drives county planning. Declining state share for higher-level placements and a method for needs-based budgeting are elements of the Act. The courts, probation and child welfare each must be part of the planning in order to draw funding for services. Integrated planning is now also a requirement.

Virginia’s Comprehensive Services Act of 1989 was originally based in a policy directive of the state that moved to an integrated system of care. To support this directive, the Governor created a policy council on community services for youth and families. This public-private consortium helped to develop the model, which came to include pooled funding, evaluation requirements and enhanced systems for developing treatment plans for juvenile offenders.

Tuell explained the powerful federal mandates that exist in both the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 2002 (JJDPA) and the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA). Both Acts support collaboration between the juvenile justice and child welfare systems. JJDPA directs expenditures toward prevention activities among a wide range of systems, and specifically to juvenile offenders who are the victims of child abuse or neglect and programs for their families. Proposed amendments add training and technical assistance around planning for this population, and data
reporting at all decision points. Amendments made to CAPTA in 2003 require continuity of treatment plans for crossover youth as they move across systems and require a state report that includes crossover statistics.

A large number of diverse and bipartisan organizations have had input into the development of this year’s proposed amendments to the JJDPA. This coalition was an important part of the strategy in both achieving consensus up front, but also in demonstrating support across a broad range of constituencies to Congress.

A component of the JJDPA strategy is illustrated through several of the examples noted. The success of this work may be partly conditioned on the care in crafting language that gives direction and support, but leaves states with substantial flexibility in addressing this work.

Conclusion

The conference attendees finished their work at Wingspread with a discussion of the structure and content of the Policy Agenda that can be found in Section IV of this document. Discussion resolved that there are several formal levels of policy makers that must be addressed: federal, state and tribal, and local. Separate recommendations are made for each of these discrete levels. In addition, there is a strong policy component in the actions that programs take to operationalize and institutionalize the policies from federal and state levels. For this reason, a program level set of recommendations is included in the Policy Guide recommendations, in addition to the three formal levels of policy makers.

Consideration was given to developing a separate level of policy recommendations for community advocates, families and youth. However, since the roles and actions of these groups are similar across all areas of recommendations, a separate level of recommendations was not created. For a solid set of policy recommendations to be carried forward, however, these important policy stakeholders need to be consulted, included and genuinely woven into the fabric of policy-making at all levels.

Six specific policy action areas were outlined and recommendations are identified for each in the Policy Guide.
Policy Action Areas

Following are the six policy areas where federal, state/tribal, local and program recommendations are made.

1. **Strategic partnerships.** By definition, crossover youth are touched by multiple systems and require services from many. Collaboration and cooperation among systems is a fundamental prerequisite for successful work with this population.

2. **Information, data and outcomes.** Knowing the frequency with which youth cross over, being able to track their progress across systems and agreeing on what the desired outcomes should be are critical elements to successful policy development. This is a logical, early focus in building successful collaborations.

3. **Family and youth engagement.** Best practice models advocate for consistent and meaningful inclusion of youth and families in service planning. In addition, active and informed involvement of families and youth in policy making at all levels is needed.

4. **Financing strategies.** New and more flexible financing is needed to both re-direct existing dollars and to target new dollars across service system silos.

5. **Practice models.** Improved outcomes for crossover youth require that systems work differently. A clearly articulated, jointly developed model of practice will target system interventions and support cross-agency work.

6. **Research and evaluation.** The key to continuous improvement in serving crossover youth is a commitment to research and evaluation. This grows the knowledge base and contributes to more efficient and effective work.
The Policy Agenda is included in Section II of this document. In it, policy recommendations are made for each of the cells of the following matrix:

**POLICY AGENDA FOR CHILDREN KNOWN TO BOTH CHILD WELFARE AND JUVENILE JUSTICE:**

(Crossover Youth)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Development and Support of Strategic Partnerships</th>
<th>Sharing of Information, Data and Outcomes</th>
<th>Family and Youth Engagement in System Design</th>
<th>Integrated and Coordinated Financing Strategies</th>
<th>Jointly developed Practice Model</th>
<th>Investment In Research And Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal Role</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(White House, Congress, and Executive Agencies)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Role</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Governor, State Legislature, Tribal Governments, Courts, State Departments of Education)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Role</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(County Manager/Board, Mayor, City Council, Educational Service Agencies, School Superintendents/ Boards)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Court and Agency Role</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice agencies, Courts, Law Enforcement and Education, Behavioral Health and Substance Abuse Services)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX 1

Family Development . . . From Prevention to Participation

Brandy Hudson and Michael Sanders
Family Development Approach

- Family development is a **process** that prepares families to meet the challenges of family life through a coordinated progressive series of activities & experiences that help them to become competent.

  - Adapted from National Collaboration for Youth

Both Philosophy & Approach

- **Values Families**
- **Recognizes Strengths & Potential**
- **Focus on Development Not Fixing Problems**
- **Engages Families as Resources**
- **Focuses on Strengthening Families**
- **Preventing Problems Not Development**
- **Ensures Families Are Included**

Family Development...

- **Prevention**
- **Preparation**
- **Participation**
FAMILY ENGAGEMENT

The **PROCESS** of *intentional & meaningful* involvement of families in the decision-making, policy development and reform efforts to improve outcomes of any system in which they are a part.

- Annie E. Casey Foundation’s Youth Engagement Strategy

**REASONS FOR FAMILY ENGAGEMENT**

**LEGAL**
- *Foster Care Independence Act 1999*

**RESEARCH**
- University of Wisconsin-Madison
- Columbia University
- Mental health field

**MORAL/ETHICAL**
- *Nothing about ME, without ME*

**3 BOLD STEPS TO TAKE...**

- Broaden OUR Thinking
- Walk OUR Talk
- Share OUR Power
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Co-Occurrence of Problem Behaviors Among Adolescents

Terence B. Thornberry, Ph.D.
Co-Occurrence of Problem Behaviors Among Adolescents

presented at


May 7, 2008

Terence P. Thornberry, Ph.D.
Director, Problem Behavior Program
Institute of Behavioral Science
University of Colorado

Topics of Presentation

1. Overlap or co-occurrence of problem behaviors.

2. Truancy and marijuana use.

3. Maltreatment and delinquency.

4. Data sources and methods.

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention's Program of Research on the Causes and Correlates of Delinquency

Denver Youth Survey
David Huizinga, Ph.D.

Pittsburgh Youth Study
Rolf Loeber, Ph.D.

Rochester Youth Development Study
Terence P. Thornberry, Ph.D.

Rochester Youth Development Study Research Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th>Phase 2</th>
<th>Phase 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 15 16 17 18</td>
<td>// 21 22 23  //</td>
<td>29 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescent Interviews</td>
<td>x x x x x x x x x</td>
<td>x x x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Completed</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>881 846</td>
<td>803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Interviews (55% Mothers)</td>
<td>x x x x x x x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Completed</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>793 827</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Topic 1: Co-Occurrence of Delinquency and Other Problem Behaviors**

**Delinquency**
**Drug Use**
**School Problems**
**Mental Health**


---

**Measures**

Persistence: exhibiting the behavior for at least 2 of 3 years during early and middle adolescence.

Persistent Serious Delinquency: serious assault & serious theft.

Persistent Drug Use: use of marijuana or harder drugs.

Persistent School Problems: low school grades (D or F) or drop-out.

Persistent Mental Health Problems: top 10% of internalizing or externalizing symptoms on Child Behavior Checklist.

---

**Overlap of Persistent Serious Offending and Other Persistent Problems Among Males**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Persistent Serious Delinquents Who Have Other Persistent Problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rochester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Use Only</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Only</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Only</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Use &amp; School</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Use &amp; Mental Health</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School &amp; Mental Health</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Use, School, &amp; Mental Health</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Topic 1: Conclusions**

1. Clear evidence of co-occurrence. Serious delinquents exhibit other problem behaviors, especially drug use.

2. But, co-occurrence is by no means inevitable. 40 to 55% of serious delinquents do not exhibit other problem behaviors.

3. There are similar patterns for females.

4. Programs need to be prepared to address multiple problems but should not assume that all serious delinquents exhibit them.
Topic 2: The Impact of Truancy on the Subsequent Initiation of Marijuana Use

Do some problem behaviors lead to the initiation of other problem behaviors?

The prior results merely say they are correlated, or that they co-occur.

Measures

Truancy: self-reports of frequency of skipping school without an excuse, collected every six months.

Marijuana use: self-reports of initiating marijuana use during the subsequent six months.

Data from the Rochester Youth Development Study

The Impact of Truancy on the Subsequent Initiation of Marijuana Use

Predicted Probability of Initiation of Marijuana Use at Age 14.5 as a Function of Truancy at Age 14
Topic 2: Conclusions

1. Truancy, especially at younger ages, is related to subsequent initiation of marijuana use.

2. Truancy is also related to the initiation and escalation of delinquency and drug use, both in Denver and in Rochester.

3. Preventing truancy may have broader effects by reducing the initiation and escalation of other problem behaviors.

4. Truancy may be a particularly useful marker variable as it is "public" and easily measured.

Topic 3: Maltreatment and Delinquency

Research Questions:

1. Is child maltreatment a significant risk factor for later delinquency and crime?

2. Does the developmental stage at which the maltreatment occurs matter? In particular, does the impact of maltreatment that occurs in childhood differ from that which occurs in adolescence?

Topic 3: Maltreatment and Delinquency (continued)

3. Is the impact of maltreatment on delinquency and crime causal?

Measurement

Child maltreatment:

a. Based on official records of Monroe County Department of Social Services,

b. Includes all substantiated instances of abuse or neglect from birth through age 17, and

c. Includes physical abuse, sexual abuse, and neglect.
Measurement (continued)

Delinquency and crime:

1. Official record of contact or arrest as a juvenile or of arrest as an adult.

2. Self-reported offending based on 32-item inventory administered at each interview. Items range from petty theft and disorderly conduct to armed robbery and aggravated assault.

3. Self-reported violence based on a 6-item subscale, including assault, gang fighting, and robbery.

4. Self-reported drug use based on a 12-item inventory ranging from marijuana to cocaine and heroin.

Research Question 1: Is child maltreatment a risk factor for later delinquency?

Child Maltreatment (Ages 0-16) as a Risk Factor for Delinquency (Ages 16-18)

* p < .05

Source: Ireland et al. (2002)
Research Question 1: Conclusions

1. As with most of the literature, lifetime measures of maltreatment are significantly related to adolescent delinquency.

2. But, most maltreated youth do not have official records and do not self-report delinquency.

Prevalence of Age-Specific Maltreatment in the Rochester Youth Development Study (n=1000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maltreatment During Childhood (Ages 0-11)</th>
<th>Maltreatment During Adolescence (Ages 12-17)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No History of Maltreatment</td>
<td>No History of Maltreatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.7%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood-Only Maltreatment</td>
<td>Adolescence-Only Maltreatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Odds Ratio

*Significantly larger than never-maltreated at p < .05

Variables held constant: sex, race/ethnicity, area poverty, social class, family structure, and parent education.

Source: Ireland et al. (2002)

Research Question 2: Does the developmental stage at which the maltreatment occurs matter?

Age-Specific Maltreatment as a Risk Factor for Delinquency (Ages 16-18)

- Official Delinquency
- Self-Reported Delinquency
- Self-Reported Violence
- Self-Reported Drug Use

*Significantly larger than never-maltreated at p < .05

Variables held constant: sex, race/ethnicity, area poverty, social class, family structure, and parent education.

Source: Ireland et al. (2002)
Research Question 2: Conclusions About Childhood Maltreatment

1. Maltreatment that occurs only in childhood is not significantly related to adolescent delinquency and other problem behaviors in the Rochester study.

2. Similar results have been observed in other studies, e.g., Benda and Corwyn (2002) and Eckenrode et al. (2001).

3. These findings suggest that developmental models that highlight the long-term consequences of early trauma may overestimate its impact and underestimate sources of resilience.

Research Question 2: Conclusions About Childhood Maltreatment (continued)

4. These results do not suggest, in any way, that childhood maltreatment is not a serious problem. It is abhorrent and has many adverse consequences.

5. Treatment and services must be provided.

6. Nonetheless, it may not be a significant risk factor for adolescent delinquency.
Research Question 3: Is the impact of maltreatment on delinquency and crime causal?

Previous results point to adolescent maltreatment as a risk factor for delinquency and crime.

But, the crucial question is whether it is a causal risk factor. If it is, then if we can reduce maltreatment we will, to some extent, reduce delinquency and crime.

Establishing Causality

Establishing causality, however, is extremely difficult with observational data, even longitudinal data.

The "ideal" design, a randomized experiment, is obviously unacceptable.

Propensity Models

Propensity score models closely approximate experimental conditions and are the strongest way to assess causality with non-experimental data.

These models assume that everyone has some underlying propensity to be maltreated. But even of those with a high propensity, only some will actually be maltreated.

Thus, we can compare those who were maltreated with those who were not, at the same propensity level.

Doing so approximates random assignment.

Results

We used 19 variables to estimate the propensity to be maltreated.

After matching on propensity scores there were no significant differences between the maltreated and not maltreated groups on any of the 19 variables.

We then investigated the causal impact of
a. childhood-only maltreatment, and
b. any adolescent maltreatment on young adult crime (ages 21-23).
**Regression Effect of Maltreatment on Early Adult Criminality, Matched Samples**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Childhood-Only Maltreatment</th>
<th>Any Adolescent Maltreatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General offending</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious crime</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent crime</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street crime</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official arrest/incarceration</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

Note: Tobit regression coefficients are presented for general, serious, violent, and street crime. Probit regression coefficients are presented for official arrest/incarceration. Standard errors are in parentheses.

**Average Predicted Count (and standard deviation) of Early Adult Criminality for Observed Status (maltreated) and Counterfactual Status (not maltreated) Among Individuals Who Were Maltreated During Adolescence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observed Status: Maltreated</th>
<th>Counterfactual Status: Not Maltreated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General offending</td>
<td>.25 (79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious crime</td>
<td>.35 (.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent crime</td>
<td>.87 (.54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street crime</td>
<td>11.44 (10.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official arrest/incarceration+</td>
<td>.54 (.22)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Dichotomous outcome: Value represents the predicted probability.

**Research Question 3: Conclusions**

1. Childhood-only maltreatment is not a cause of subsequent criminality.
2. Any adolescent maltreatment is causally linked to subsequent criminality, including serious and violent offending.

**Topic 3: General Conclusions**

1. In general, maltreatment is related to a host of negative consequences.
2. But, this effect is almost entirely limited to maltreatment that occurs in adolescence, either adolescence-only or persistent maltreatment.
3. Among the outcomes for the individual are: delinquency, drug use, violence, contact with the juvenile justice system.
Topic 3: General Conclusions (continued)

4. Using a propensity score approach there is also evidence that the impact of maltreatment on these outcomes is causal.

5. All of these results point to the importance of developing effective programs to...
   a. prevent adolescent maltreatment in the first place, and
   b. treat the victims to ward off these consequences.

Thank You.
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Denise C. Herz, Ph.D
California State University—Los Angeles
Joseph P. Ryan, Ph.D.
University of Illinois—Urbana-Champaign

Wingspread Conference
May 8, 2008

Overview of the Report

- Purpose of Building Multisystem Approaches in Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice is to summarize (1) extant literature related to crossover youth and (2) the findings from a national survey of states conducted as part of this project.
- The results of this work are organized in the report in the following chapters:
  - Chapter 1: The Relationship between Maltreatment and Delinquency
  - Chapter 2: The Prevalence and Characteristics of Crossover Youth
  - Chapter 3: System Responses to Crossover Youth
  - Chapter 4: State Perspectives on Issues Related to the Handling of Crossover Youth
  - Chapter 5: Building a Multisystems Approach to Handling Crossover Youth

Handling Crossover Youth & State Perspectives of Related Issues

Overview of Findings & Reflections

Themes from the Survey Data

- Disconnect between agencies and policy-makers
- Disconnect between state and county administrators
- Varied Use of Promising Approaches
- The Role of Collaboration
- Access to Services & Placements
- Access to Funding
Respondents’ Perceived Level of Importance of the Crossover Issue Across Entities

(Percentage Reporting “Important” or “Very Important”)

- Probation
- CW
- MH
- Corrections
- Education
- Governor
- County Boards
- Legislature

Disconnect across State and County Respondents

- While the results showed a great deal of consistency across state and county respondents, several patterns of inconsistency were also found.
- The inconsistencies potentially reflect different perspectives based on the roles and responsibilities of state administrators compared to county administrators (i.e., a focus on policy v. a focus on practice).

Promising Approaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Siegel &amp; Lord’s (2004) Categories</th>
<th>Type of Promising Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case Assignment</td>
<td>- Dedicated Dockets/One Judge Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Continuity of Counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Flow Management/ Case Planning &amp; Supervision</td>
<td>- Joint Pre-Hearing Conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Joint Court Orders &amp; Court Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Interagency Planning Meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Multidisciplinary Teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Probation or CPS Liaisons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interagency Collaboration</td>
<td>- Integrated/Shared Information Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Funding Arrangements across Child Welfare &amp; Probation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use of Promising Approaches

- The most often used approaches were:
  - Dedicated dockets/one judge approach
  - Interagency planning meetings
  - Use of a multi-disciplinary team to assess and manage cases
- The least likely approaches used were:
  - Integrated/shared information systems
  - Joint pre-hearing conferences
  - Use of probation liaisons
High Collaboration States v. Low Collaboration States

Individual responses were aggregated to the state level for the use of promising approaches was summed. The average ratings across states for the use of collaborative states and states with extremely high scores were identified as high collaborative states.

Average Ratings for Cross-Training

Available Cross-Training is...

High Collaboration States

Collaboration was rated as most significant strength.

Collaboration was rated as most significant challenge/problem.

Further investigated in two ways:
• Additional analysis of survey data
• Follow-up calls to jurisdictions

Average Ratings of Collaboration

Behavioral Health

Education

Interagency
Average Ratings for Assessment & Case Management

Follow-Up Calls: Collaboration
- Characteristics
  - Strength of collaboration varied
  - Dependent upon people—those who valued and were committed to collaboration
  - Seen as essential to effectively handling crossover youth
- Keys to Accomplishing Collaboration
  - Leadership
  - Compromise
  - Clarity in roles and responsibilities
- Obstacles to Collaboration
  - High turnover/dependence on individuals
  - Staff unsupportive of collaboration
  - Differences in philosophies and procedures—“turf”

Services, Placements, & Funding
- #2 Challenge/Problem=Availability of services and placements
- #3 Challenge/Problem=Access to funding
- The question arises: Do these issues affect both high collaboration and low collaboration states in similar ways?
Follow-Up Calls: Services

- Although respondents felt that crossover youth did not necessarily require different services from non-crossover youth, they believed that crossover youth required more attention and case management with regard to:
  - Early identification and intervention (i.e., responding to status offenses more effectively among crossover youth)
  - Stabilization in placement
  - Permanency
- More services, in general, were necessary. This included:
  - Gender-specific programming
  - Day centers
  - Treatment for mental health problems and substance abuse
  - Educational assessments and services
  - Transitional services and supports
  - Mentors
  - Community-based services in general

Follow-Up Calls: Placement

- Stabilizing a placement for crossover youth=primary issue
- Need for additional access to current placements as well as more innovative placements
  - In particular, there is a need for more therapeutic living arrangements that were structured and intensively supervised
  - Programs need to address mental health problems, substance abuse, and problem behavior simultaneously
- Current placements often inappropriate because they don’t offer needed levels of supervision and structure
- Keys features to improving the overall handling of crossover youth were consistency and listening—i.e., listening and responding to the needs and desires of crossover youth

Identifying Common Principles, Values, and Beliefs

- Previously, there was little consistent understanding of who crossover youth are or how they are handled
- The report compiles information that has been fragmented to show patterns and trends in these areas
- It is hoped that this information will guide your discussions and help you identify a common vision for accomplishing a multisystems approach for handling crossover youth
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Overview of the Report

- Purpose of *Building Multisystem Approaches in Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice* is to summarize (1) extant literature related to crossover youth and (2) the findings from a national survey of states conducted as part of this project.

- The results of this work are organized in the report in the following chapters:
  - Chapter 1: The Relationship between Maltreatment and Delinquency
  - Chapter 2: The Prevalence and Characteristics of Crossover Youth
  - Chapter 3: System Responses to Crossover Youth
  - Chapter 4: State Perspectives on Issues Related to the Handling of Crossover Youth
  - Chapter 5: Building a Multisystems Approach to Handling Crossover Youth

Overview of Presentation

I. What specific factors in child welfare system increase or decrease risk of delinquency?

II. How do crossover youth compare with non child welfare delinquency cases?

III. What happens to crossover youth subsequent to initial arrest?

IV. Implications, questions, future directions

I. FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH DELINQUENCY IN CHILD WELFARE

CHILD WELFARE \[\rightarrow\] JUVENILE JUSTICE
I. FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH DELINQUENCY IN CHILD WELFARE

All Maltreated Youth (n=18,676)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Substantiated Maltreatment</th>
<th>Not Delinquent</th>
<th>Delinquent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Abuse</td>
<td>3,664 (85)</td>
<td>625 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglect</td>
<td>5,146 (85)</td>
<td>886 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Abuse</td>
<td>10 (71)</td>
<td>4 (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Exposure</td>
<td>161 (92)</td>
<td>14 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Abuse</td>
<td>521 (89)</td>
<td>65 (11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² = 105.56, p<.001

Malnutrition Recurrence

| One substantiated report                | 5,215 (88)     | 684 (12)   |
| Two substantiated reports              | 1,390 (82)     | 297 (18)   |
| Three or more substantiated reports    | 1,061 (80)     | 263 (20)   |

χ² = 84.54, p<.001

Placement

| No placement                           | 5,875 (89)     | 697 (11)   |
| At least one placement                 | 1,791 (77)     | 547 (23)   |

χ² = 234.86, p<.001

Placement Instability (n=1,994)

| No change in placement                 | 574 (88)       | 77 (12)    |
| Two placements                         | 323 (89)       | 42 (11)    |
| Three placements                       | 292 (84)       | 79 (16)    |
| At least four placements               | 581 (79)       | 156 (21)   |

χ² = 28.84, p<.001

I. FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH DELINQUENCY IN CHILD WELFARE

- Age (older youth)
- Race (African American, Hispanic)
- Recurrence of Maltreatment
- Substitute Care Placement
- Placement Instability

All Maltreated Youth (n=18,676)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Substantiated Maltreatment</th>
<th>Not Delinquent</th>
<th>Delinquent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Abuse</td>
<td>4,151 (95)</td>
<td>205 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglect</td>
<td>5,843 (95)</td>
<td>275 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Abuse</td>
<td>15 (88)</td>
<td>2 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Exposure</td>
<td>173 (99)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Abuse</td>
<td>2,122 (96)</td>
<td>93 (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² = 38.32, p<.001

Malnutrition Recurrence

| One substantiated report                | 6,415 (96)     | 242 (6)    |
| Two substantiated reports              | 1,676 (96)     | 72 (4)     |
| Three or more substantiated reports    | 1,248 (92)     | 113 (8)    |

χ² = 59.20, p<.001

Placement

| No placement                           | 7,185 (97)     | 233 (3)    |
| At least one placement                 | 2,154 (92)     | 194 (8)    |

χ² = 111.88, p<.001

Placement Instability (n=2,091)

| No change in placement                 | 650 (94)       | 39 (6)     |
| Two placements                         | 400 (94)       | 26 (6)     |
| Three placements                       | 281 (97)       | 10 (3)     |
| At least four placements               | 640 (93)       | 45 (7)     |

χ² = 3.84, p> .05
I. FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH DELINQUENCY IN CHILD WELFARE

Does Type of Placement Matter?

Study of Group Homes in Los Angeles

- 20,309 youth with at least one placement episode
- between 7 – 16 years of age
- no arrests prior to the first placement.
- 15,071 (74%) foster care
- 5,238 (26%) at least one group home placement

One difficulty is trying to disentangle placement from individual effects.

Group Homes Serve Higher Risk Youth
- significantly older
- more likely African American
- more likely male
- more likely to have 4+ placements (82%)
- more likely to have AWOLs (20%)

How to Isolate Placement Effect?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Foster Care (n=4,113)</th>
<th>Group Home (n=4,113)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>white</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physical abuse</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWOL change</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB change</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at first placement</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement changes</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of stay</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Adolescents in group homes more than twice as likely to be arrested

**other important findings**

• The risk of arrest increases by 80% for African American youth
• The risk of arrest increases by 80% for males
• The risk of arrest increases by 32% for Hispanic youth
• Placement instability increases risk
  • overall and changes associated with AWOL and behavior

---

### Findings from Study of Group Home Placements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location at Time of Initial Arrest</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group Home</td>
<td>675 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Care</td>
<td>900 (54%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWOL (run away from placement)</td>
<td>66 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Home Trial Visit</td>
<td>15 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>15 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,671 (100%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

79% of all arrests occur while the child is in **placement**

---

### Summary of Placement and Instability Research

• Adolescents in substitute placements increased risk
• Adolescents with multiple changes in placement increased risk
• Adolescents with at least one group home placement increased risk
• African American youth increased risk

---

### How About Protective Domains?

**Plenty of Targets – Not Much Intervention**

---

### How Can Child Welfare Systems Decrease Risk?

What do we know about social bonds?

Young adults leaving care, Courtney et al. (2001) report that:

- 75% of all youth felt “somewhat close” or “close”
- 40% of these youth also report staying in contact
- 20% report receiving continued emotional support

Despite high levels of perceived attachment in care:

- 37% reported running away
- 32% reported feeling lonely
- 28% felt foster parents treated their biological children better
- 34% reported being “mistreated” at least some of the time
**Study of Social Bonds in Illinois**

- **Subsidized Guardianship Waiver Demonstration**
  - 278 African American males
  - in foster care between 11 and 16
  - no prior delinquency petition

- **Illinois Department of Children & Family Services**
  - records of maltreatment and placement

- **Cook County Juvenile Court**
  - official delinquency petitions

**Measures**

**Relationship/Attachment**
1. How often does [fp] help you with your problems? (.815)
2. How often does [fp] let you know he/she cares about you? (.780)
3. When something is bothering you, how often do you talk with [fp]? (.768)
4. Do you feel like you are part of this family? (.761)

*Cronbach’s Alpha .7923*

**Monitoring**
1. When you go out how often do you tell someone in your home where you are going?
2. How often do any adults in your home check out your friends or people you hang out with?*

**Perceptions of Permanence**
1. Do you think you will be living with a different family within the next 12 months?

**Measures...continued**

**Commitment and Involvement**

**Education**
1. How important is it to you to get good grades?
2. How important are the things you learn in school?
3. Do you plan to attend college?
4. Are you participating in after-school activities?

**Religious Organizations** (Religiosity)
1. In the past 30 days have you gone to a religious service or church school in a church, mosque, temple or other place of worship?
2. In the past 30 days have you gone to any other events at a church, mosque, temple or other place of worship with your family?
3. In the last 30 days have you done any community service or volunteer work through a church, mosque, temple or other place of worship?
**Sample Characteristics:** children were 12.8 years old at time of interview, average 2.5 years between interview and collection of delinquency data, 44% had three or more prior placements, 39% expected to change placements within the coming year, 93% had plans for college, 61% participated in after school activities and 71% were involved with religious organizations.

**Delinquency:** 11% had at least one subsequent delinquency petition.

**Permanence:** the rate of delinquency increases for children with two or more placements (prior to first interview). The rate of delinquency also increases for children expecting a change in placement.

**II. So How Do Crossover Youth Compare with Other Adolescents Entering the Juvenile Justice System?**

**Data Sharing Agreement in Los Angeles**

Data sharing agreement provides administrative records for all minors involved with DCFS and Probation between 2002 and 2005

- 82,000 unique individuals in probation
  - 230,259 arrests
- 91,860 unique individuals in child welfare

**Summary of Findings**

**Attachment:** More positive relationships with foster care providers were associated with lower delinquency rates.

**Monitoring:** No significant relationship.

**School/Education:** School suspensions were related to subsequent delinquency. The youth with recent suspensions were more likely to have a subsequent delinquency petition.

**Involvement with Religious Organizations:** Recent involvement with religious organizations significantly decreased the risk of delinquency.
Comparing Youth at Initial Arrest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>DCFS (7%)</th>
<th>Non DCFS (93%)</th>
<th>Overall (100%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American**</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic**</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male**</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Offense</th>
<th>DCFS (69,009)</th>
<th>Non DCFS (69,000)</th>
<th>Overall (138,009)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent**</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** III. So What Happens Subsequent to the First Arrest? **

** What Happens Subsequent to Arrest? **

First Time Offenders 69,009

- Dismissed 26% v. 24%
- Probation 58% v. 73%
- Suitable Placement 21% v. 11%
- Corrections 21% v. 16%
IV. Conclusions and Questions

Placement, Instability, Social Bonds, and Delinquency

• Children in placement at increased risk of delinquency
• Group home placements associated with the largest increase
• As placement changes increase so does risk of justice involvement
• Children with stronger social bonds are less likely to enter juvenile justice system
• What is it about placement that increases the risk of arrest?
• How can CW systems strengthen bonds and decrease risk?
• What research is needed to help inform promising areas of prevention?

Comparison at Initial Arrest

• The child welfare system is responsible for 7% of all new arrests, this does not include closed cases or repeat offenders
• Yet the child welfare system is responsible for 14% of all African Americans in the juvenile justice system.
• Does this result from differential treatment within the child welfare system – the provision of mental health services – the provision of substance abuse services – placement decisions?
• Children entering juvenile justice from DCFS are also younger, more likely to be female, and more likely associated with violent offense

Child Welfare Status and Judicial Dispositions

• Adolescents coming to probation with open child welfare cases – regardless of the offense committed – are less likely to receive probation
• This is problematic for at least two reasons; the cost associated with secure setting placements, and the relative ineffectiveness of such interventions.
• What are the long term implications for moving maltreated youth into secure setting justice oriented placements?
• How does this contribute to DMC in the juvenile justice system?
• Can child welfare systems develop effective strategies to serve crossover youth in probation settings?
APPENDIX 4

System Integration

Bruce Knutson
System Integration Presentation

Background:

Home to a population of over 1.8 million people, King County is the most populous county in Washington State and the 14th most populous county in the nation. Located on Puget Sound, and covering 2,134 square miles, King County is nearly twice as large as the average county in the United States. Although the county land area includes urban, suburban, rural and wilderness areas; the vast majority of the county’s population resides in densely populated urban and suburban areas. Well endowed with a thriving technology industry, King County enjoys slightly higher rates of education and slightly lower rates of poverty than other counties in the state and nation. Children (0-17) comprise approximately 21 percent of the county’s population. Over the past decade, King County has emerged as a leader in systems reform, at both the state and national levels.

One of the reasons for this success is that this region has consistently demonstrated a commitment to comprehensive organizational planning and collaborative approaches toward improving outcomes for youth and families. In the past 10 years, there have been numerous examples of this commitment that have yielded valuable lessons regarding the benefit of this approach. For example, the 2001 Juvenile Justice Operational Master Plan (JJOMP), which is a collaborative effort to implement best practices and research-based programs, has helped shape the course of juvenile court and detention services for the past 10 years. With this foundation, the County and its partners have participated in several reform efforts including the Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative, Reinvesting in Youth, and Reclaiming Futures.

It is these types of innovative efforts that have supported an environment for constructive dialog regarding cross system coordination and integration – and shared responsibility for the youth and families of King County. With this backdrop of successful system reform efforts, we began our perhaps most challenging system reform effort.

The King County Systems Integration Initiative (KC-SII) is a consortium of state and local youth-serving agencies that have come together to examine and improve the coordination and integration of services for youth involved in the juvenile justice and child welfare systems. Following the Child Welfare League of America (CWLA) Juvenile Justice National Symposium in June 2003, Casey Family Programs contacted CWLA staff to discuss the strategic planning framework on system coordination and integration featured at the conference. This pivotal conversation led to two one-day symposiums attended by an array of juvenile justice and child welfare stakeholders in King County. As a result of the symposiums, the King County Systems Integration Initiative was formed and the membership of an Executive Committee was immediately identified to guide and oversee the process. In March of 2004, the Executive Committee contracted with CWLA to partner with them to examine and analyze relevant issues impacting improved system coordination and integration.
This initiative has experienced the full support of the highest-level decision-makers of every organization involved and all of the participating agencies have committed substantial time as well as in-kind and financial resources to the effort. It is championed by the Chief Judge at King County Juvenile Court, the Juvenile Court Administrator, and the Washington State Children’s Administration Regional Administrator. Well-established and highly functional planning committees have already made considerable progress toward achieving the goals of the initiative.

One important reason for this success is the support received by KC-SII from the Child Welfare League of America (CWLA) and Casey Family Programs. CWLA consultants have provided guidance and technical assistance to KC-SII since its inception. They have helped maintain the momentum of the initiative by channeling the passion and energy of the KC-SII leadership into productive work sessions and by providing a national context for this work. The Seattle Field Office of the Casey Family Programs is not only a founding member of KC-SII but also continues to provide funding, crucial expertise, technical assistance and they host all our meetings and events.

Benefits:

1. **Improved relationship’s across systems and enhanced coordination of services.**
   - Charter Agreement. A charter that defines the goals and scope of work of the initiative and makes an explicit participatory commitment on the part of each agency involved governs the King County Systems Integration Initiative. This commitment has led not just to the development of a formal charter agreement, but also to the ongoing investment of time and energy to forge strong and productive working relationships. After 4 years of working together a strong foundation exists in King County to support sharing of responsibility and resources for multi-system involved youth.
   - Guide for Information Sharing. We developed a legal guide that shows a lot more information can be shared between child welfare and juvenile justice workers and court participants than we thought. Barriers to information sharing and collaboration are primarily cultural, technological, and tactical, rather than legal. Legal barriers most often arise when entities such as schools, health care providers, and mental health/substance abuse providers become involved. In light of these findings, a striking conclusion is that the greatest disparity may be between what the law actually allows regarding information sharing, and what those implementing the law believe it allows. Such misunderstanding contributes to a culture of fear and distrust, resulting in highly fragmented systems with few structures in place for needed information sharing.
   - System Integration Protocols. We developed a working agreement detailing how juvenile probation counselors and Children’s Administration caseworkers work together in support of dual status youth and their families. Cross-system training has begun among initiative partners to increase familiarity and develop relationships which support shared responsibility and services.
2. **Improved access to services and improved services.**

- **Mental Health and Education Systems.** The mental health and education systems are crucial partners in KC-SII. These systems represent the greatest opportunities to address holistically the needs of children and their families at the earliest point of contact with any system. However, the complexity of these systems presents significant challenges. KC-SII formed separate taskforces focusing on mental health and education resulting in concrete recommendations. The mental health taskforce identified a series of recommendations including the need for a standardized tool, information sharing guidebook, ongoing training for all justice and child welfare personnel on mental health issues and services, and increase the capacity and access to research-based programs. The taskforce further detailed the insufficient resources available to adequately serve people with mental illness. This report positioned the KC-SII to inform and influence passage of a one-tenth of one-percent sales tax increase to fund needed mental health and substance abuse services. This tax will generate approximately $11 million to provide services for children and youth. This includes funding for:
  - Comprehensive chemical dependency outpatient services to parents in recovery.
  - Prevention services to children of substance abusers.
  - School district based mental health and substance abuse services.
  - School based suicide prevention.
  - Increase capacity for social and psychological assessments for child welfare and juvenile justice youth.
  - Wraparound family, professional and natural support services for emotionally disturbed youth.
  - Reception centers for youth in crisis.
  - Expanded crisis outreach and stabilization for children and youth.
  - Expand family treatment court services and support to parents.
  - Expand juvenile drug court treatment.
  - Crisis intervention training program for King County Sheriff, police, jail staff and other first responders.
  - Peer support and parent partners/family assistance in navigating the child welfare and juvenile justice systems.
  - Increased access to mental health and chemical dependency outpatient services for people not on Medicaid.

- **The Education Systems Integration Taskforce** developed an initiative called PathNet to create a coordinated countywide network to retrieve court-involved youth who are truant or out-of-school and guide them into a seamless pathway of education and career opportunities. PathNet is founded on the concept that each youth receives a strength-based assessment that leads to a plan (no plan no hope) with a referral that is supported by an adult who cares (care manager). Existing
alternative education and vocational programs will be coordinated and linked via a regional network to serve a high number of court-involved youth who have disengaged or dropped out of school. Once referred, education and employment specialists will work with youth and provide consistent long-term support to help youth achieve academic success and transition to employment and/or post-secondary education. This well developed plan positioned the KC-SII to successfully acquire and leverage funding support from federal, state and local sources.

- The PathNet Initiative resulted in the collection and analysis of data to verify that there is a strong relationship between dropping out of school and becoming involved in the justice system in King County.
- The PathNet position paper influenced the first legislation in Washington State on dropouts that resulted in funds to support a statewide oversight taskforce and a number of grants requiring interagency participation.
- The PathNet concept has driven local partners to provide positions within their own budgets to support PathNet care managers.
- The PathNet Initiative has enhanced the development of multi-system efforts to seek and receive a Department of Labor award to expand the local network of providers.
- Members of the PathNet Initiative have mobilized their resources and agencies to co-apply for foundation grants using the multi-systems approach.

3. Enhanced support from foundations and legislators and great funding partnerships.
   - MacArthur Foundation Models for Change Grant. King County joined the Center for Children and Youth Justice and five other counties in Washington State to be selected as a site for the MacArthur foundation’s Model for Change Initiative. The funding and technical assistance King County will receive focuses on three areas – multi-system collaboration, mental health, and the PathNet plan to guide school dropouts into meaningful education and career paths. MacArthur is excited about our work and allocated resources in order to accelerate implementation.
   - United States Department of Labor Grant. The Seattle King County Workforce Development Council was just awarded a $2 million grant, which significantly expands the Pathnet initiative to 12 case managers and 3 project connections coordinators.
   - Building Bridges Legislation. The Washington State Legislators supported a five million dollar bill on dropout prevention that was based, in part, on the work of PathNet leading to grant awards that were required to have multi-agency fiscal and programmatic commitments.
Reinvesting in Youth Legislation. The Washington State Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP) identified evidence based treatment programs which are cost effective in reducing crime rates and future prison costs. Since savings accrue to multiple levels of government King County developed a plan to share with the state the cost of evidence based treatment programs. The state legislature unanimously passed the Reinvesting in Youth Legislation which reads “the legislature finds that there are youth and family-focused intervention services that have been proven through rigorous evaluation in the state of Washington and elsewhere to significantly reduce violence and crime while saving more public safety dollars than they cost. Under current state laws, no local government acting alone has the financial incentive to invest in these cost-effective services because the savings accrue to multiple levels of government with the largest savings going to the state. It is the intent of the legislature to create incentives for local government to invest in cost-effective intervention services that reduce crime by reimbursing local governments with a portion of the cost savings that accrue to the state as a result of local investments in such services.” The state legislature allocated almost $10 million for evidenced based treatment programs.
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I. Value of working across systems; benefiting from different perspectives

What have we learned?

1) Improved services through cross-agency/cross systems work. I will use 2 examples: one behavioral health and one educational to demonstrate this point.

2) Cross systems work has the potential to fundamentally change the way we do business and improve outcomes for kids, families and communities. I will use nationally-recognized Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative of the Annie. E. Casey Foundation (JDAI) and our interface with Massachusetts child welfare system, the Department of Social Services (DSS), as the example.

Cross systems successes for Massachusetts Department of Youth Services (DYS) were not inexpensive. It can be quite costly to contract with content experts but this investment will almost certainly yield desired results, e.g. in-custody medical services provided by health care providers.

Don’t reinvent the wheel: It is very difficult to provide high quality services internally. You are constantly playing catch-up. MA DYS seeks to identify public and private providers who provide high quality services and then use RFR process to contract with them, e.g. substance abuse services through Massachusetts Department of Public Health (DPH) contractor.

Don’t do anything first: Imitation is the sincerest form of flattery. Seek out and implement evidenced-based practices. Note that I said “EBP” not “best practices”. EBP are practices with a research base which validates that the practice has been proven to work with your population in similar circumstances:

   e.g. Blueprints
        OJJDP model practices
        CJCA shared expertise
        Private foundation pilot programs

Context: Massachusetts DYS historically is a highly privatized system (1980’s and Ned Loughran). 70% of services provided through a network of private nonprofit providers.
BEHAVIORAL HEALTH

As recently as 2004, behavioral health services in DYS were provided by bachelor-level “counselors”

In 2004, there were two in-custody suicides at DYS. Rocked the system

“Safety First” interdisciplinary task force formed under direction of state Secretary of Health and Human Services to address issues suicides exposed.

**Hired** fulltime licensed masters-level clinical social workers to provide behavioral health services.

**Implemented DbT** as the behavioral health modality across all programs – public and private; detention, assessment, treatment and revocation; initiated a system-wide professional development process; participated in a DbT certification process for all clinicians; hired on-site DbT coaches.

Got a [grant from the Massachusetts DPH](https://www.mass.gov/) to hire Family Intervention specialists who work with the families of each youth who is hospitalized as a result of a mental health crisis while in DYS custody.

**MOU with Massachusetts Department of Mental Health (DMH)**, to provide access to mental health intensive residential facilities for DYS youth through independent evaluations, we are on the right track with DMH but still some distance to go with mental health system to improve services for behaviorally challenging youth with serious mental health issues:

E.g. in 2006 out of a caseload of 2000 kids in DYS, referred 20 youth (.01%) but only 6 youth accepted into public mental health beds. JJ youth tend to be aggressive and assaultive and end up back in juvenile court on new charges as a result of behavior in mental health programs.

Promising development with establishment of [Forensic Transition Teams](https://www.mass.gov/): a collaborative effort between DMH and DYS to transition youth aging out of DYS to adult mental health services.

So what were the results of this collaborative effort?

**SLIDE: SUICIDALITY**

Actually have a very small percentage of youth who evidenced serious mental health issues with self-injurious behaviors. Less than 3% of the 1000 youth in custody or about 30 youth.

**EDUCATION**

Currently, DYS has BA-level teachers for general education services at DYS [Massachusetts Department of Education (DOE) handles special education services for](https://www.mass.gov/)
youth in the custody of DYS through a DOE contract with educational provider which places Special Education (SPED) teachers in DYS facilities.

Prior to State investment in early 2000’s, DYS provided Pretty dismal educational services but with the support of the Chairwoman of the Senate Ways and Means Committee, who is now the President of the Senate, and the Governor, DYS made the following improvements to its educational services:

- **Hired a local educational collaborative** to provide the DYS state program educational services and required all programs including our private providers to hire licensed, certified teachers to reduce teacher turnover of 70% and 30% vacancy rates. Annual turnover now down to 12%

- **Implemented salary parity with public schools** to erase $10,000 disparity between public school salaries and DYS teacher salaries and provided professional development days for teachers.

- **Adopted the state DOE standards** for all curricula taught at DYS; created a universal DYS transcript; aggressively pursued credit recovery in the public schools for DYS kids returning to the public schools; and participate in the state’s standardized tests.

- **Piloted a vocational pathway** for DYS kids in the community by using state DYS funds to pay local public school vocational education teachers to teach DYS youth after school in their classrooms.

  **Why?** To prove to the vocational education high schools that juvenile justice youth can learn and will not be behavior problems. Back this up with case management services and good quality education at DYS or participation in GED programs for all youth enrolled in the vocational educational program. Success in passing MCAS – state standardized test requirement for graduation - has proved the point.

- **Piloted a job readiness pathway** for DYS youth in the community by using state DYS funds to pay local One Stop Career Centers to serve DYS youth. We call this program “bridging the opportunity gap”.

  **Why?** Because the federal funding for these workforce development centers is dependent upon job placement results and adolescents generally, and juvenile offenders particularly, are hard to place in jobs. Our funding allows the Workforce Investment Boards to build in tolerance for false starts and failure, that is not provided for in the federal funding stream.

**SLIDES: HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMAS, GED, MCAS**

So what have we learned? Small classrooms and teacher expectations do make a difference!
Most recently, we have implemented a performance outcome measure in all of our residential programs, which uses a pre-placement literacy test (TABE) and a pre-release literacy test (TABE), to measure improvements in literacy.

**JUVENILE DETENTION REFORM AND CROSS OVER YOUTH**

We are now focused on applying what we have learned about cross agency/cross systems work in behavioral health and education, to dual status youth involved in the child welfare system and the juvenile justice system.

We are now focused on applying what we have learned about specialized services to a systemic reform effort.

**What do we know?** 70% of the youth in DYS have DSS histories.

**Detention v. Commitment:** From 2000-2007, the DYS committed case load dropped 1/3, from 3000 kids to 2000 kids, but detention admissions remained relatively flat at about 5000 - 6000 per year.

**SLIDES: NEW COMMITMENTS; DETENTIONS**

**One day snapshots:** Out of 350 detention beds at DYS, as many as 20%, or 70 kids, were in custody on any given day “awaiting DSS placement”

Typical child welfare case: Child is in an out-of-home placement; child is assaultive or destructive in the placement; foster parent, or residential provider staff, contact DSS (or in some instances, the police); charges are brought and the child enters the juvenile justice system. In many instances, all offense behavior has occurred in a social services setting and there are no instances of crimes having been committed in the community.

CAVEAT: Serious crimes do occur in placements. E.g. one young woman in two separate mental health placements attempted to kill her roommates. She is now in a joint DYS/DMH funded private placement.

But in most instances, child is arraigned on minor charges in juvenile court, DSS has no placement available, and the child cannot return home, or to the placement because that is where the incident occurred. Child then is held on bail – Massachusetts is one of a very few states nationwide with a bail statute which applies to adults and juveniles – and is sent to a locked secure detention facility operated by DYS.

“Peer Contagion”: Joe and Denise cover the issue of “peer contagion” in their paper but as much as “peer contagion” may occur in child welfare residential placements, it is significantly exacerbated when a child welfare client is sent to a juvenile justice detention facility. This may be the case of the lesser of two evils but I don’t think it is a Solomon’s choice.
Basically, as reported in the Justice Policy Institute’s report, “Dangers of Detention”, we are putting low risk/high need youth with high risk, more delinquency involved youth. Clearly, the longer the child welfare youth is exposed to delinquent youth, the poorer the outcomes for the child welfare client. It is not only exposure to the wrong peer group but also interruption in education and other services, removal from the community, coupled with the trauma of being locked up, which results in poorer outcomes for the high need youth.

In Massachusetts, a youth held on bail is removed from the courtroom by court officers and held in a court holding cell; then cuffed and shackled and placed in a sheriff’s van; strip searched at intake at the DYS detention facility, issued institutional clothing and put into the population. While DYS tries to separate youth by age/offense, virtually 100% of DYS detention facilities are locked hardware secure settings.

Turning now to the questions framing this discussion:

1. **How do we address the issue of cross-over youth? Can we interrupt this child welfare to prison pipeline? Can child welfare system create a RESPITE residential capacity for children between placements?**

   **Advantages to Child Welfare Residential Respite Programs:**
   - Not locked secure juvenile facility.
   - More appropriate peer group
   - Better chance of continuing service plan at new location. E.g. go to same school; continue counseling with clinician or substance abuse provider; more opportunities for visits with foster family or future foster family, staff from prior residential placement.
   - May even serve as a “time out” and increase chances of returning to same placement.
   - No delinquency record.

2. **Integrated system with shared values, principles, beliefs that difficult-to-manage child welfare clients should not default into the juvenile justice system.**

   What are the opportunities for a common vision?

   **Has focus on “family strengthening” had unintended consequences?**
   - Focus on keeping neglected and maltreated children with their birth families resulted in closing of child welfare residential capacity to move resources to family-focused community based services.
   - When child-welfare placement fails for any number of reasons, system lacks capacity to place child in crisis.
As in Washington State, JDAI opened the door to potential systems’ integration between child welfare and juvenile justice in Massachusetts.

- Through collaborative strategies from JDAI framework for reform, DYS is working on an MOU with DSS for notice to DSS when a DSS-involved youth enters a DYS detention facility. Reduce length of stay and potential damage to youth awaiting DSS placement.

- Worked with State Secretary of Health and Human Services to pilot “One Family, One Plan” to coordinate service delivery for clients with multiple agency involvement.

- Also participating with child welfare/mental health/and transitional assistance/welfare departments in focusing on providing connections for transitional age youth who are too old for foster homes and too young for independent living. Provide support structure these adolescents need to become independent but close enough for contact with family and community.

**CONCLUSION**

1) We need to work together to address issue of unintended consequences of a child welfare systems reform that may have reduced out-of-home placement options and led to increased juvenile justice system involvement.

2) And probably most important of all, just as the adult prison system has been found to disproportionately incarcerate men of color, that is increasingly an issue for the juvenile justice system nationally and in Massachusetts. After one year employing the JDAI framework in Massachusetts, we have seen a reduction in detention admissions from nearly 6000 per year to 5000 per year (15%) but early signs are that the disproportionality has gone up.

3) As Shay Bilchick noted in our conference call for this panel, to what degree are we willing to come out of our silos and “go upstream” to see why these children/youth keep falling into this “river of no return”. 
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Barriers to and Opportunities for Collaboration

Bruce Kamradt
**What Are Some of the Barriers to Multi-System Collaboration Between Child Welfare & Juvenile Justice**

- Different aims and purposes of each system; child welfare focuses on child safety & protection and Juvenile Justice on accountability & community safety.
- Court processes & jurisdictional issues do not always align ex. court orders written differently, terminating at different times, etc.
- Child Welfare & Juvenile Justice do not always approach treatment issues the same way, child welfare focuses on children’s mental health needs and Juvenile Justice focuses more on substance abuse issues; neither always integrates mental health to bridge treatment needs of child.
- There is often a lack of good cross systems training for Child Welfare and Probation workers. Neither are regularly trained to understand roles & duties of counterpart and how those roles are complementary and how they can better collaborate.

**What Are Some of the Barriers to Multi-System Collaboration Between Child Welfare & Juvenile Justice (cont’d)**

- Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice can be administered by totally separate entities ex. State versus County, different state agencies for each system, public versus private operation.
- High turnover rates affect relationship building, and acquired knowledge of other systems, etc.
- There may be no formal Memorandum of Understanding (MOU’s) outlining shared responsibility for planning and monitoring youth who cross systems, including a conflict resolution process.
- Lack of integrated intake and assessment procedures across systems.
- Lack of compatibility and flexibility of funding sources for each system or how to blend, braid or make funds flexible across systems.

**Funding Challenges That Affect Collaboration Across Child Welfare & Juvenile Justice**

- Juvenile Justice tends to have more local funding sources versus Child Welfare who uses more state & federal funding.
- Restrictiveness of Medicaid funding for detention, correctional placements, etc.
  - Recent restrictions on targeted case management funding for both Child Welfare & Juvenile Justice.
- Much of the funding gets spent on the costs of institutional placements ie: residential treatment or group home versus community-based care and it is often difficult to shift & re-allocate these “silos” to focus on community-based care.
- Juvenile Justice and Child Welfare often have different procurement & contracting approaches, they don’t use fee-for-service approaches to increase flexibility.

**Funding Challenges That Affect Collaboration Across Child Welfare & Juvenile Justice (cont’d)**

- The systems do not often have willingness and/or technical knowledge in braiding, blending & pooling money through case rates, capitation and de-categorizing funding sources through managed care approaches.
- Court orders often are written in a manner that hinder use of funds for community-based programming versus court issuing more flexible orders allowing system to determining what services are put in place and how they will be paid.
- Changes in living situation of child may change eligibility for funding ex. 4-E, Medicaid.
- Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice are not always aware of how to use EPSDT, Medicaid options & waivers to increase funding opportunities.
Opportunities for Collaboration – All of the Following Are Employed in Wraparound Milwaukee for SED Youth Served Across Child Welfare, Juvenile Justice & Mental Health

- Coordinated service teams
- Single care or treatment plans across systems for defined population
- Pooled funding & single payor
- Single administrative organization
- Single release of information for multiple systems
- Internet-based information technology across systems
- Consolidating and coordinating provider network and fee-for-service systems
- Flexible court orders
- MOU’s across systems and collaboration coordinating bodies
- Shared value base
- Re-directing funds from institutional-based care to community-based care
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Key Barriers and Proven Strategies -
Information Sharing

Janet Wiig
Key Barriers and Proven Strategies

Information Sharing

Barriers

- Laws
- Lack of Knowledge
- Differing Values/Goals
- Complexities of Record Keeping
- Inadequate Technology
- Absence of Will

Strategies

- Structure and governance for handling information sharing issues
- Common goals
- Legal and policy foundation
- Information sharing tools
  - Agreements/Memoranda of understanding
  - Field guides for practitioners
  - Consents/authorizations to release information
  - Information sharing technology
  - Model legislation
  - Training curricula

Resources

- OJJDP Guidelines for Juvenile Information Sharing
- CWLA Guidebook for Juvenile Justice and Child Welfare System Coordination and Integration
- CWLA Guidebook, Legal and Policy Analysis for System Integration
- Juvenile Law Center monograph, Protecting Youth from Self Incrimination when Undergoing Screening, Assessment and Treatment in the Juvenile Justice System
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Integrated Solutions for Delaware Youth in Crisis

Cari DeSantis
Integrated Solutions for Delaware Youth in Crisis

Cari DeSantis, Secretary
DE Dept. of Services for Children, Youth & Their Families

A Practical Approach

DSCYF Consolidated Structure
Enabling Legislation 1993 consolidated children’s services
Categorical improvements ensued
Rearticulated Mission 2001
Created Common Vision Statement 2001
Strategic Goals / Strategic Plan

Think of the CHILD First!
Child-focused services system
Holistic services
Inspired workforce
Leading-edge management
Dedicated partnerships

Vision Statement:
Think of the Child First!
Safety
Stability
Self-esteem
Sense of Hope
Available Options

- Enhanced Foster Care (group, family, tx)
- Detention Alternatives (eg. EM)
- System of Care = More community options
  - Esp. Home, school, community services
  - Wrap-around, MST, Independent Living
- Diversionary Programs
  - Drug Court, Mental Health Court, Truancy Court
  - Individualized Residential Treatment

Child Welfare Expertise

*Improved Service & Stability for JJ Youth*

- Primary case manager = coordinate care/service
- Experts in family engagement / kinship
- Family Crisis Therapists in detention centers
- Greater knowledge of community support
- Domestic violence, substance abuse specialists attached to regions
- Better match youth to foster home
- Independent living services for teens
- DE McKinney-Vinto keeps kids in school of origin

Child Mental Health Expertise

*Improved Access & Quality for All Children*

- RFP Processes – consult / participate
- Foster care training – group and family
- MH screen/tx for every child entering foster care
- Psychologists in detention centers
- JJ service design / oversight
  - Grace / Snowden – Girls & Boys Town Model
  - Intensive Outpatient Programs – SA, ISB
  - Gender-specific
  - Prevention – CDCP / trauma-specific grant

Results

- Increased stability in foster care
- Increased support for foster parents
- Reduced detention
- Reduced recidivism
- Less reliance on JJ residential placements
- Reduced LOS in residential programs
- Increased return to school
Results

- One of lowest absence of abuse in foster care (99.88% vs US std 99.68%)
- Stable placements (96.3% v US std 86%)
- Recidivism rates trending down
  - First-time probation youth migration
  - Levels 4 and 5

Challenges Ahead

- Community capacity building
- Family Court alignment
- Family work esp. front-end of JJ system
- Categorical nature of federal and private philanthropic funding
- Schools’ zero-tolerance policies
- Youth adjudicated with sex offenses
- Youth with developmental delays

Resources

- DE Code Title 29, Chapter 90 – Charter
- Policy 201 – Integrated Service Planning
- Policy 209 – Dept. Service Coordination (Primary CM)
- System of Care Manual and Guidebook
- Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative
- Foster Care Reform Report and Model
- DSCYF Four-Year Strategic Plan

Website:  www.kids.delaware.gov
Website:  http://delcode.delaware.gov
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Dually Adjudicated Youth

Judge Michael Nash
“The child welfare system has an important impact on the juvenile justice system. Research is clear that youth who have been abused and neglected are at heightened risks for early onset of delinquency.”


**Key Questions**

- How do Dependency and Delinquency systems coordinate their responses when youth is involved simultaneously with both systems?
- Is there communication, coordination, and cooperation among courts, agencies, attorneys involved with youth?
Five Categories of Court Practices Relevant to Handling of Dual Jurisdiction Matters

- Screening and Assessment
- Case Assignment
- Case Flow Management
- Case Planning and Supervision
- Interagency Collaboration

Screening and Assessment

- Delinquency Referrals
  - Are court and agencies aware of involvement in abuse and neglect matter?
- Dependency Referrals
  - Are court and agencies aware of involvement in delinquency matter?
- Are there protocols for notifying each other when dual involvement occurs?
- Are there assessment processes so system can assess risks and allocate resources?

Case Assignment

- Are cases calendared by One Family/One Judge?
- Are there dedicated dockets?
- Do attorneys have special qualifications?

Case Flow Management

- Are there joint pre-hearing conferences?
- Are Dependency and Delinquency hearings combined?
- Are there joint court orders and/or court reports?
- Are probation officer and social worker attendance mandated at hearings?
Case Planning and Supervision

- Are joint child welfare and probation case plans submitted to court?
- Are there specialized case management and supervision units?
- Are multidisciplinary teams actively involved in case planning?
- Are there special qualifications or training required for case managers?
- Are there reduced caseload sizes?
- Are there family centered interventions?
- Is there gender-specific programming for girls?
- Are there programs for young offenders?

Interagency Collaboration

- Is the court involved with the relevant agencies?
- Are there formal written agreements between agencies?
- Are there collaborative funding arrangements?

California/Los Angeles Practice
OVERVIEW

California
- 58 Counties
- Courts bifurcated in some counties

Los Angeles
- Population – 10-11 million
- 20 full time dependency courts - 27,500 youth – 2 locations
- 28 full time delinquency courts – 20,000 plus youth – 10 locations
- 13 Informal and Juvenile Traffic Courts – 170,000 plus citations – 11 locations
- 100 Dependent youth charged in Delinquency Court each month

Cal Welfare and Institutions Code § 241.1

(a) WHENEVER A MINOR APPEARS TO COME WITHIN THE DESCRIPTION OF BOTH SECTION 300 AND SECTION 601 OR 602, THE COUNTY PROBATION DEPARTMENT AND THE CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICES DEPARTMENT SHALL, PURSUANT TO A JOINTLY DEVELOPED WRITTEN PROTOCOL... INITIALLY DETERMINE WHICH STATUS WILL SERVE THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE MINOR AND THE PROTECTION OF SOCIETY. THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF BOTH DEPARTMENTS SHALL BE PRESENTED TO THE JUVENILE COURT...... AND THE COURT SHALL DETERMINE WHICH STATUS IS APPROPRIATE FOR THE MINOR......

Cal Welfare and Institutions Code § 241.1

(b) THE PROBATION DEPARTMENT AND THE CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICES DEPARTMENT IN EACH COUNTY SHALL JOINTLY DEVELOP A WRITTEN PROTOCOL TO ENSURE APPROPRIATE LOCAL COORDINATION IN THE ASSESSMENT OF THE MINOR...... AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF RECOMMENDATIONS BY THESE DEPARTMENTS FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE JUVENILE COURT.....

Cal Welfare and Institutions Code § 241.1

(d) Except as provided in subdivision (e), nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize the filing of a petition or petitions, or the entry of an order by the juvenile court, to make a minor simultaneously both a dependent child and a ward of the court.

Key Elements of WIC 241.1

1. Youth can potentially be in both Dependency and Delinquency systems
2. Youth cannot be in both systems simultaneously
3. Probation Department and Children’s services must conduct joint assessment and make recommendation to court on which status meets best interests of youth and protection of community
4. Court decides status

241.1 Results

Pre 241.1
- dependent youth likely to be declared delinquent youth
- no coordination between systems
- communication after youth declared delinquent
- “system dumping”

Post 241.1 Implementation
- 25-30% of dependent youth who crossover become formal delinquents
- 60% plus remain under dependency jurisdiction but under informal delinquency supervision —“informal dual status youth”
- communication and coordination through assessment process
241.1 Weaknesses
- poor assessments
- no coordination of services for informal dual status youth
  - result is many eventually become formal delinquents
- dependent youth who become formal delinquents
  - stay in delinquency system longer
  - lose social worker
  - lose attorney
  - lose judge
  - family services suffer

AB 129 – A Chance for Change
- Allows individual counties to experiment with creation of system where youth can be under formal jurisdiction of dependency and delinquency systems simultaneously
- Requires concurrence of Chief Probation Officer, Director of Children and Family Services, Presiding Judge of Juvenile Court
- 7 Counties, including Los Angeles, create dual status systems

AB 129 – A Chance for Change
- Potential Benefits
  - Continuity of services for youth and family
  - Continuity of representation
  - Enhanced agency collaboration
  - Best of both systems
  - Potentially shorten delinquency jurisdiction

Los Angeles Model
- Enhanced Assessment
- Potential Disciplinary Team (MDT)
  - Social worker
  - Probation officer
  - Representative from Department of Mental Health
  - Education advocate
- MDT conducts assessment
- Better case plans
- MDT serves as case manager post-disposition
- Courts from both systems remain involved
Issues

- Team building
- Tension caused by need to assess youth while protecting Fifth Amendment, Fourteenth Amendment rights
- Adequacy of services, particularly evidence-based services

Preliminary Results of Pilot Project

- 12% of youth declared formal delinquents
- All are dual status

Lessons for Child Welfare System

LA County 241.1 Cases: An Overview of Characteristics and Disposition Outcomes
- Denise C. Herz, Ph.D., California State University, Los Angeles
- Joseph P. Ryan, Ph.D., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Arizona Dual Jurisdiction Study
- National Center for Juvenile Justice (NCJJ), 2003

Key Characteristics of Crossover Kids

- Substance abuse
- Severe emotional mental health problems (psych meds)
- Truancy
- Severe academic deficiencies
- Special Education
- Multiple Placements
  - Group homes
  - Foster care
  - Kinship care
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Enacting Legislation to Facilitate Sharing of Child Welfare Records


The South Dakota Process

Judge Janine Kern
Enacting Legislation to Facilitate Sharing of Child Welfare Records

THE SOUTH DAKOTA PROCESS

1) A Federal Mandate was Necessary to Provide Impetus to begin the Work
   • Identify leaders to push compliance

2) Educate about the Need to Share Child Protection Records with other Stakeholders
   • “Why do you need the records?”

3) Bring Key Stakeholders with Decision Making Authority to Table
   • Social Services, Judges, Corrections, Prosecutors, Defense Attorneys, CASA, Guardians Ad Litem

4) Obtain an Experienced, Highly Skilled, Diplomatic and Credentialed Facilitator to Mediate Discussions and Guide the Process Forward
   • Technical Assistance – OJJDP
   • Child Welfare League of America

5) Identify the Agency to Draft, Introduce and Lobby the Bill

6) Effective Implementation
   • Educate system players about the legislation and how to access the records
   • Continue to meet as a committee to address problems with production of records
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South Dakota Codified Laws Currentness

Title 26. Minors

Chapter 26-8A. Protection of Children from Abuse of Neglect (Refs & Annos)

Judge Janine Kern
26-8A-13.1. Certain child protection records to be provided to the court, court services, state's attorney, or agencies--Discovery--Fees

Notwithstanding the provisions of §26-8A-13, or any other statute to the contrary, in any case that a child is under the jurisdiction of the court pursuant to chapter 26-8B or 26-8C, upon a request for information, the Department of Social Services shall, with due regard to any federal laws or regulations, including the Health Information Portability and Accountability Act of 1996, as amended to January 1, 2007, the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, as amended to January 1, 2007, and the federal rules governing the confidentiality of alcohol and drug abuse patient records pursuant to 42 C.F.R. Part 2, as amended to January 1, 2007, in the following instances:

1. Conduct a child abuse and neglect central registry check and provide the results to the court, court services, or the state's attorney to determine the appropriateness of returning a child to the parents or placing the child with another caretaker at any time during the pendency of the proceedings;

2. For a child committed to the Department of Corrections, conduct a child abuse and neglect central registry check and provide the results to the Department of Corrections for purposes of determining the appropriateness of returning a child to the parents or placing the child with another caretaker; and

3. For a child committed to the Department of Corrections, release copies of, or the equivalent to, the child's: request for services history summary, initial family assessments, court reports, and family service agreements to the Department of Corrections for treatment planning purposes.

Upon receipt of an order of the court, the Department of Social Services shall make its child protection services file related to the child or the child's parents and siblings available to the court, court services, or the state's attorney with the exception of information protected by the Health Information Portability and Accountability Act of 1996, as amended to January 1, 2007, the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, as amended to January 1, 2007, and the federal rules governing the confidentiality of alcohol and drug abuse patient records pursuant to 42 C.F.R. Part 2, as amended to January 1, 2007. Under no circumstances may the court order the release of information pertaining to pending abuse or neglect investigations.

The information released under this section is discoverable to the parties under the provisions of chapter 26-7A, but is otherwise confidential. However, the court, court services, or the Department of Corrections may release the information in their possession or any portion necessary to institutions and agencies that have legal responsibility or authorization to care for, treat, or supervise a child. The attorneys for the child and respondents may review the records with the child and the respondents but may not copy or release copies of the records. A pro se litigant is entitled to review the records but may not copy or release copies of the records.

The Department of Social Services shall impose reasonable fees for reproduction of its records released under this section. The Department of Social Services shall promulgate rules pursuant to chapter 1-26 for any fee imposed for records reproduction.

Source: SL 2007, ch 166, § 1.


Current through the 2007 Regular Session and Supreme Court Rule 07-07
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Federal and State Policy Session

John Tuell
Friday May 9th – Federal & State Policy Session


Section 223(a)(9): provide that not less than 75 percent of the funds available to the State under 5632 of this title shall be used for:

(C) comprehensive juvenile justice and delinquency prevention programs that meet the needs of youth through the collaboration of the many local systems before which a youth may appear, including schools, courts, law enforcement agencies, child protection agencies, mental health agencies, welfare services, health care agencies, and private nonprofit agencies offering youth services;

(D) programs that provide treatment to juvenile offenders who are the victims of child abuse or neglect, and to their families, in order to reduce the likelihood that such juvenile offenders will commit subsequent violations of law;

E) provision of training, technical assistance and consultation to develop coordinated dependency and delinquency system plans for early intervention and treatment of victims of child abuse and/or neglect and their families, in order to reduce the likelihood that such juvenile offenders will commit subsequent violations of law;

Section 223(a)(26): to the maximum extent practicable and in consideration of applicable confidentiality laws, implement a system to ensure that if a juvenile is before a court in the juvenile justice system, public child welfare records (including child protective services records) relating to such juvenile that are on file in the geographical area under the jurisdiction of such court will be made known to such court; such a system would result in:

(i) a compilation of data reflecting information on juveniles entering the juvenile justice system with a prior reported history of child maltreatment (abuse and/or neglect) through arrest, court intake, probation and parole, juvenile detention, and corrections; and

(ii) an analysis of necessary services for the prevention and treatment for victims of child maltreatment; and a plan for providing such services for the prevention and treatment of victims of child maltreatment and their families who have entered the juvenile justice system.

Section 223(a)(27): establish protocols, policies, procedures and systems to incorporate relevant child protective services records into juvenile justice records for purposes of establishing and implementing treatment plans for juvenile offenders (see 26 above)

Child Abuse Prevention & Treatment Act & June 2003 amendments

Section 106(a)(13): supporting and enhancing interagency collaboration between the child protection system and the juvenile justice system for improved delivery of services & treatment, including methods for continuity of treatment plan and services as children/youth transition between systems.

Section 106(d): state data reports must include the number of children/youth under the care of the State child protection system who are transferred into the custody of the State juvenile justice system
Colorado Revised Statutes Section 1. Title 24, Article 1.9
3(a) the development of a more uniform system of collaborative management …may reduce duplication and eliminate fragmentation of services; increase the quality, appropriateness and effectiveness of services provided; encourage cost-sharing among service providers; and ultimately lead to better outcomes

Section 24-1.9-102 Memorandum of understanding - local-level interagency oversight groups - individualized service and support teams - coordination of services for children and families:

(b) Identification of services and funding sources
(c) Definition of the population to be served
(d) Creation of an oversight group
(e) Establishment of collaborative management processes
(f) Authorization to create individualized service and support teams
(g) Authorization to contribute resources and funding
(h) Reinvestment of moneys saved
(i) Performance-based measures
(j) Confidentiality compliance

California Welfare & Institutions Code Section 241.1 & Assembly Bill 129
241.1 (a) Whenever a minor appears to come within the description of both Section 300 and Section 601 or 602, the county probation department and the child welfare services department shall, pursuant to a jointly developed written protocol described in subdivision (b), initially determine which status will serve the best interests of the minor and the protection of society. The recommendations of both departments shall be presented to the juvenile court with the petition that is filed on behalf of the minor and the court shall determine which status is appropriate for the minor.

(b) The probation department and the child welfare services department in each county shall jointly develop a written protocol to ensure appropriate local coordination in the assessment of a minor described in subdivision (a), and the development of recommendations by these departments for consideration by the juvenile court.

(e) …This protocol shall include:

(1) A description of the process to be used to determine whether the child is eligible to be designated as a dual status child.
(2) A description of the procedure by which the probation department and the child welfare services department will assess the necessity for dual status for specified children and the process to make joint recommendations for the court's consideration prior to making a determination under this section. These recommendations shall ensure a seamless transition from wardship to dependency jurisdiction, as appropriate, so that services to the child are not disrupted upon termination of the wardship.

AB 129 Juvenile Court: Dual Status Children - This bill created the category of a Dual Status Child who is considered both a dependent child and a ward of the juvenile court.

Other Examples:
South Dakota HB1059
Pennsylvania Needs Based Budgeting - Act 148
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Virginia’s Comprehensive Services Act: Legislative and Policy Approaches to Serving At-Risk Children, Youth and Families
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Virginia’s Comprehensive Services Act: Legislative and Policy Approaches to Serving At-Risk Children, Youth, and Families

M. Gail Ledford

Since the 1980s, when the federal government began to devolve more of the funding and responsibility for human services to the states, there has been a growing expectation for state and local governments to develop the strategies and resources for addressing the needs of their populations and to deal effectively with the complex interdependencies among the child-serving human service and educational systems (Agranoff and Pattakos 1989). Growth in program expenditures, lack of efficiency, and duplication of efforts across public agencies—and the difficulties families encounter in their attempts to access quality treatment services for their children—are problems that plague public human service institutions (Koyanagi 1994). Moreover, there has been increased demand for services, accountability, productivity, and flexibility (Cohen and Cohen 1999).

Although there are significant public policy, administrative, and resource allocation implications, particularly for state and local governments, the public policy literature has not offered models that effectively address these concerns. Much attention has been given in the public policy literature to other complex cross-system, financial, and outcomes issues in human services, such as those surrounding welfare reform. Moreover, much has been written over the past two decades about the need for greater coordination and collaboration among human service agencies to meet the complex needs of “at-risk” children and those with severe and chronic emotional and behavioral disturbances (Koyanagi 1994; Knapp 1995). However, innovations in the public-sector systems for meeting the needs of these populations have not been well documented in the popular media or academic journals.

Across the country, legislators, public administrators, advocates, parents, and other stakeholders have joined together to bring about changes in the ways that publicly funded services are provided to at-risk children and their families. A number of initiatives have moved toward greater coordination of services, but many have failed because they were unable to accomplish the system-oriented goals they envisioned. These initiatives could not create the necessary organizational structures, develop cross-agency budgets, maintain political support, and effectively plan for worsening state and local fiscal conditions (U.S. General Accounting Office 1992).

Through a sweeping policy directive, Virginia created a system to address the difficult problems at-risk children and families experienced in identifying and accessing public-
sector human services from agencies that operated independently and did not deliver comprehensive services. By developing a collaborative, integrated system of care for this population, the state of Virginia’s Comprehensive Services Act (CSA) provides an effective illustration of a policy approach that creates the potential for positive change, flexibility, and resilience.

A Fragmented Service-Delivery System

The public institutions charged with the responsibility for meeting the needs of troubled and at-risk children and youth have a well-established history, typically encompassing foster care, mental health, juvenile justice, and education. The division among these disciplines has contributed to the institutionalization of federal, state, and local agencies as separate, discrete entities, each with its own mission, mandates, values, policies, and practices; educational and professional requirements for staff; eligibility criteria; and funding mechanisms. There is great overlap among these systems at all levels of government with regard to the populations they serve and the funding availability for programs and services and little collaboration among the agencies that deliver them. The result is a fragmented service-delivery approach that is often difficult to access and limited in its ability to address comprehensively the needs of children, youth, and their families—a situation further compounded by the additional challenges of increased costs and demand for services.

These demands and cost factors at the state and local level have, in turn, influenced the way that states and localities implement federal mandates, which has implications for individual children and their families. Federal requirements mandate that funding must be made available to serve children who are in foster care and those eligible for special education services. Other at-risk children are considered “nonmandated,” and funding for services is not required under federal law.

Implications for Children and Their Families

For some of the children whose problems are less serious and restricted to a specific domain, a single-agency approach can be satisfactory. However, for more seriously disturbed children who are more likely to have severe problems in multiple domains, services and resources may not be well coordinated to meet the child’s and the family’s needs (Koyanagi 1994). Addressing the needs of a child with a serious emotional disorder could potentially involve the departments and agencies responsible for foster care, mental health, juvenile justice, and education. Families approach the agency best suited to meet their child’s needs based on their own knowledge of the various services offered by each. Typically, families move from agency to agency, seeking advice from respective experts; they negotiate the maze of the various eligibility criteria and expose themselves and their child to repetitive, expensive assessments, screenings, and service programs. Because of the discrete division among disciplines, recommended interventions often fall short of the comprehensive approach necessary to address the complexity of the child’s needs.

Implications for Agencies

Under these conditions, child-serving agencies are constrained in several ways. First, without the benefit of collaboration and coordination across disciplines, a single-agency perspective puts the responsibility for positive outcomes for the child and family with each agency. This approach precludes utilization of other agencies’ staff and fiscal resources. Second, it makes a single agency responsible for having a broad base of knowledge and expertise, when that agency’s mandates and financial resources to support those mandates may be limited. Third, it requires that each agency dedicate staff to work with each child. A child and family interacting with multiple agencies could involve three, four, or more professionals working independently of one another. Fourth, each agency must
maintain and support the administrative functions necessary to fund, deliver, and monitor services. Redundant processes within each agency excessively burden the limited financial resources of both local and state levels of government, providing little, if any, opportunity for a local government to forecast service demand and costs for the community’s at-risk population.

**Creation of the Comprehensive Services Act in Virginia**

Prior to the enactment of the CSA, Virginia struggled with many of the same service-delivery issues as most other states: “tension between local and state government regarding responsibility for and control of decision making, delivery and financing; absence of proactive cooperative planning among child-serving agencies; and an over-reliance on the use of hospitalization and residential placement for children experiencing [serious] emotional and behavioral difficulties” (Cohen and Cohen 1999, 153). Among other factors, several key stakeholders and a significant defining event set the stage for what has become one of the most comprehensive reform initiatives in children’s services in the country (O’Brien 1996).

As in most other states, in the mid-1980s Virginia’s service-delivery system for children and youth with serious emotional and behavioral disturbances was relatively weak. In 1986, the governor’s wife’s interest and concern about children’s mental health ultimately led to the development of the First Lady’s Forum, comprising senior-level policymakers, service providers, and service consumers, including cabinet secretaries responsible for health and human services, juvenile justice, and education and commissioners responsible for major child-serving departments. The Commissioner of Mental Health, the key stakeholder, directed the forum to identify creative, effective, and efficient ways to coordinate services across state and local agencies with the intent of improving the system of care for children and youth (Cohen and Cohen 1999).

In 1989–90 the Department of Planning and Budget (DPB) conducted its Study of Children’s Residential Services, examining a number of issues related to children and youth that had been identified over a 10-year period by legislative study committees, state agencies, service providers, advocacy organizations, and consumers. Focusing on children who were placed out of their homes and into residential treatment settings, the study investigated approximately 14,000 cases across the four primary child-serving agencies in Virginia (JLARC 1998) and found that children and families with multiple needs were receiving services from multiple agencies and that children were being counted multiple times. Moreover, although the number of children placed out of their homes into residential care settings annually was relatively stable, the cost of care for these children had increased dramatically. A 22 percent annual increase in expenditures raised serious concerns about the ability of the state and its local jurisdictions (i.e., counties and cities) to fund their share of services in the future at that rate of growth.

The DPB study described a strategy for achieving the policy, programmatic and financial changes necessary to address the rising costs of services, and the fiscal implications for the state. In response to the study—and the interest it generated within the legislature—the incoming governor created the Council on Community Services for Youth and Families (1991), a public-private consortium charged with developing a new service-delivery model, funding mechanisms, and training programs for state and local government staff; tracking caseloads and expenditures; and evaluating the proposed system.

Under the direction of the council’s chairman, the Secretary of Health and Human Resources, public hearings were held across the state during the summer of 1991 to solicit input from local stakeholders. Feedback included broad support for the philosophy and
goals identified in the proposal, a strong interest in avoiding cost shifting from state to local governments, concerns about anticipated increased staff time for implementation, and the need for local government flexibility to design systems tailored to the unique needs of Virginia’s diverse communities. The resulting legislation, introduced in the 1992 General Assembly session, proposed expansive policy changes, the redesign of long-established state and local service-delivery systems, funding mechanisms, and administrative processes for four large departments at the state level and the corresponding agencies at the local level.

Despite broad-based support from the child-serving community and constituents during the public hearing process, several influential localities lobbied against the legislation. Aware of this pressure from local communities, the 1992 legislature moved cautiously, authorizing legislation that redesigned the service-delivery system but did not restructure the funding mechanisms. A revised plan for funding was submitted during the 1993 General Assembly session, one that was more acceptable to localities because it capped the percentage of local contribution to service costs and modified the state-local cost-sharing funding formula in other ways to the advantage of the state’s cities and counties. The legislation became effective on July 1, 1993.

Implementing the CSA

Implementation of the CSA as of July 1, 1993, marked the beginning of an ongoing, incremental process of change among the various stakeholders in the legislature, state and local agencies, and the private service-provider community. The legislation significantly affected the policies and practices of local government agencies and how they financed and provided services to eligible populations of troubled children and their families.

Prior to the CSA, public child-serving agencies had their own funding resources; for each of these agencies in local government, the counterpart state agency allocated funding for specific services delivered only through that agency. Under the CSA, independent funding streams were combined, and a “pool” of funds was created at the state level and allocated to localities based on a funding formula. Nine independent funding streams that had previously funded certain juvenile court placements, special education services, foster care services, and mental health services were consolidated to form the CSA state pool of funds. Rather than each agency accessing its own funding, under the CSA, local interagency teams accessed the local pool of funds to finance services. In FY 1994, localities were allocated funding based on their actual prior year expenditures for the services that fell under the purview of the CSA. A process was included in the state funding structure to allow localities to request supplemental funding if their spending exceeded the initial base allocation—a necessary measure, given the historical expenditure growth experienced throughout the state.

Under the CSA, agencies could no longer make unilateral decisions about the treatment and service needs for children and their families. To access the pooled funds, local governments were required to establish a collaborative structure whereby multidisciplinary, multiagency teams comprising professionals from the various child-serving disciplines would identify problems comprehensively, taking into account the entirety of a child’s and family’s needs, and develop and review the treatment plans. These teams were authorized to expend funds from the CSA pool to finance services for children, which greatly enhanced the possibilities for better outcomes.

Local agency practice under the new arrangement required that parents be included as an integral part of the service planning. In its study, the council found that plans often were developed for children that included very restrictive out-of-home residential placements without the involvement of the family. Formerly, parents and guardians were told what
was needed for their child; now, they participated in the planning and decision making.

The CSA legislation mandated that both the state and localities streamline the variety of existing committees and teams and create a high-level, interagency team with responsibility for CSA policies and practices. The state-level team (the State Executive Council) comprises leaders of the key child- and family-serving agencies, a private-service provider, a local government official, and a parent representative. The team at the local level (the Community Policy and Management Team) must include the local agency heads of the primary child-serving agencies, a private-service provider, and a parent representative. Under the direction of its local team, a community has the flexibility to create policies, procedures, and services that are responsive to its individual, unique needs and experiences. For those children and families whose needs cannot be addressed through a single public agency approach, services can be provided utilizing CSA funds, typically by purchasing services in the private sector.

Incremental Policy Making to Enhance Virginia’s Coordinated System

The CSA entered its eighth year of implementation in July 2000, and although the original legislation remains fundamentally intact today, there have been important enhancements. The flexibility inherent in the initial legislation allowed for both programmatic and legislative modifications to meet unanticipated demands and changing conditions.

Trends in Caseloads and Costs

Costs associated with services funded through the CSA have continued to increase (see Figure 1). Some of the cost increase can be attributed to an expanded definition of children who are eligible for services and a broader range of services funded through the CSA. Although there has been an increase in caseloads (see Figure 2), the overall rate of increase in expenditures is greater than the corresponding increase in the number of children served. This finding affects both the state and local governments because funding is a state and local cost-sharing arrangement. Statewide, approximately 60 percent of CSA costs are state funded, and 40 percent are locally funded.

Local governments are also burdened administratively and financially by the mandate for coordinated, collaborative service planning, and they have voiced their concerns to the Virginia legislature through their individual political representatives. The CSA thus remains an important public policy issue throughout the state.

Developments in the Virginia General Assembly

A 1994 study examined state and local expenditures and caseload growth among local agencies, and 1995 legislation required localities to develop policies to assess eligible
parents for their ability to contribute to the cost of the services provided through the CSA. This change was to provide an additional revenue source to offset costs associated with services to children and to increase the role of family involvement in the planning and delivery of services.

In 1996, the Virginia General Assembly increased the duties of the State Executive Council to include—

1. providing administrative support and fiscal incentives for local operation of comprehensive service systems to address local government concerns about the costs of implementing the CSA, especially because little additional funding was made available to localities to implement and administer the program ($5,000–$25,000, depending on CSA expenditures and other locality factors);

2. overseeing coordination of prevention and early intervention programs under the administrative control of member agencies to ensure that the council dedicated some of its energy to addressing children’s needs on the “front end” by more effectively coordinating its member agencies’ prevention programs, allowing for earlier intervention to help minimize the need for costly services required for children once they become seriously disturbed; and

3. publishing and disseminating to the General Assembly a report on the CSA for the next succeeding biennium to remedy the lack of information and data available for decision making and planning and to comply with the legislature’s request for such information. The report would include a fiscal profile of previous and current year expenditures, the identification and establishment of goals for the CSA and the costs of implementing such goals, and information and recommendations necessary for greater improvements and coordination of the service-delivery system.

Although the CSA did curb the 22 percent annual growth in expenditures for the types of out-of-home placement services cited in the 1989–90 DPB study, expenditures increased by 21 percent from July 1, 1993, through June 30, 1994, and caseloads grew by 17 percent. As a result, the General Assembly directed the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission (JLARC) in 1996 to study the administration of the CSA. The JLARC is the oversight arm of the Virginia General Assembly. It was established in 1973 to review and evaluate the operations and performance of state agencies and programs. Specifically, the JLARC was required to (1) study the ways in which administrative, financial, and accounting requirements are implemented and services are forecast, delivered, and utilized at both the state and local levels and (2) make recommendations for additional improvements to the overall program as well as strategies for containing costs.

The commission’s initial report, released on January 7, 1998, found that “CSA eligibility criteria gives higher priority to certain groups” of children (JLARC 1998). Language in the CSA guarantees that mandated youth—primarily children in foster care and special-education students who require a private placement outside the public school system—must be provided with services to meet their individual needs. Other children (e.g., juvenile offenders and children with mental health problems) are categorized as “nonmandated”; that is, they are not covered by the “guaranteed service” language and are served at the discretion of localities. Because they imposed additional financial and administrative burdens on localities, the controversial study recommendations did not become law until 1999. Local jurisdictions must now weigh the costs of implementing local changes to comply with the CSA against the dollars that will be lost from the state share of funding for services if they fail to comply.

In March 2000, the General Assembly further refined and streamlined administrative processes, and on September 1, 2000, the...
DPB released a report recommending that the CSA set achievable and measurable goals and monitor performance and compliance with state guidelines for service utilization. The report calls upon state and local governments to develop and track performance indicators and use these indicators to determine trends and initiate system improvements (Department of Planning and Budget 2000).

**Discussion**

The CSA was initiated to address one of Virginia’s most vulnerable populations. It involved a participatory, open process beginning with the Council on Community Services for Youth and Families and its working committees that first designed the CSA framework over an 18-month period. Throughout the planning, implementation, and modification of the CSA, there have been many opportunities for input from a variety of key stakeholders, including both parties and chambers of the legislature, local elected officials, state and local administrators, public agency staff, private service providers and consumers. Dialogue among these stakeholders and findings from several research studies conducted since the implementation of the CSA have resulted in continual policy reassessment, as evidenced by the multiple legislative enhancements to the original act.

With the enactment of the CSA legislation came criteria under which certain groups of children were eligible to access funding for services. Agency staff wanting to utilize the funding must ensure that children meet certain eligibility criteria, as opposed to the single-agency criteria required prior to enactment of CSA. Federal laws mandate that services be made available to children who are in the foster care system and who have special education requirements. Thus, state and local governments must provide funding regardless of the number of children or the extent of their needs.

Although the CSA has greatly expanded access to funding for many children and families, it has not negated the fiscal and administrative stress experienced by state and local government—not the dilemma facing children and their parents when a child is not categorically mandated to receive funding under the CSA. Because at-risk children who are not in the foster care system or otherwise eligible for special education (i.e., children served through juvenile court or mental health or alcohol and drug service agencies) are considered nonmandated, localities are not required by law to make such funding available to purchase services on behalf of this population. Moreover, the portion of funding set aside for nonmandated children is limited by a formula cap, thereby restricting the amount of funding that the state will match as its share.

A review of case records by the JLARC in 1998 concluded that nonmandated children are often as much in need of services as are the children who are categorically eligible to access funding. The Virginia State Executive Council determined that approximately 20,660 children were at severe and acute risk levels in 1998, yet they were not eligible for mandatory services through the CSA. The projected costs for services for these children ranged from approximately $121 million to $306 million, depending on service options (Commonwealth of Virginia 1998). In Virginia and in many other states, when families do not have access to necessary treatment services for their children, they may be "told to give up custody" of their child to the child welfare system in which their involvement "in key decisions about their children’s mental health, health, and education” is limited (Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law and the Federation of Families for Children’s Mental Health 1999, 13). Because of the distinctions between mandated and nonmandated children—a categorical definition rather than one based on the severity of a child’s disturbance, the complexity of his or her needs, or the risk posed to the child and/or the community—and because localities can choose not to fund services for nonmandated children, children are not treated equally across communities.
Estimates of the at-risk population vary, so it is difficult to project service demand and related costs. The General Assembly in its 2000 session did appropriate $8.5 million over the next biennium to serve the nonmandated population but without reference to the size of the actual unmet need. Consequently, yet another study has been commissioned to develop a scientific approach to identifying the extent of underfunded populations (specifically, children and youth with serious emotional disturbances who require out-of-home treatment services), the scope of the service needs, and the fiscal impact of the services.

Conclusion

Virginia’s CSA is currently one of only a handful of comprehensive reform initiatives of at-risk children’s services systems across the country. Although several states have embarked on broad systemic changes, Virginia has taken the lead in an attempt to alter the funding structure and service-delivery model for at-risk children, youth, and families by setting forth in policy a new way of planning, coordinating, and funding services. Communities are collaborating and recognizing that for children with complex needs, complex solutions are required. These solutions are developed best when a broad base of individuals, including families, come together to plan and support an approach. A Virginia Commonwealth University study (1996) indicated that under the CSA, more children received services than would have under the old system (because the CSA expanded eligibility criteria), that children were served in less restrictive environments, and that localities have developed resources in their communities. Throughout the evolution of the CSA, legislation has prompted improvements to the system. Some of the enhancements were the result of extensive study and research; others resulted from individual stakeholder concerns (e.g., the $8.5 million budget amendment that will serve nonmandated children).

This funding provision was not the result of sophisticated analysis; rather, it was a way to attend to a public policy problem in a complex environment. Policymakers “often cannot wait for the ideal test of hypotheses” (Sarbaugh-Thompson, Lobb, and Thompson 1999) when it comes to serving vulnerable populations, so some policy decisions will continue to be driven by experience and concerns for the future.

Although the CSA has achieved positive results, continued to receive political support, and adapted over time to respond to changing demands and conditions, the course of its future developments is uncertain. The incremental policy and development that has characterized the CSA since its inception has not been the result of strategic planning and textbook public policy processes (Nakamura 1987) but rather the result of “groping along” (Behn 1988). This approach can also bring about retrenchment of gains in a different political or economic environment. Until the concrete benefits of comprehensive service-delivery systems can be shown to outweigh their costs—and the value of this investment is broadly accepted by the public and their political representatives—initiatives such as the CSA may remain the exception rather than the norm.

M. Gail Ledford is manager of the Comprehensive Services for At-Risk Children, Youth and Families program in Fairfax County, Virginia. She is also a doctoral student at the Center for Public Administration and Policy, Virginia Polytechnic and State University. Her research interests include social policy and children’s rights.

Notes

1. Because the literature does not clearly differentiate between the at-risk population and those youth who are seriously emotionally disturbed, this article uses the terms interchangeably (Madison 2000).
2. Although the state receives federal funding to offset a portion of both state and local costs, the complexity of federal cost sharing, eligibility criteria, and regulations is beyond the scope of this article.
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