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**Study Overview**

- OJJDP initiated Dual Systems Design Study in October 2015*

- Goals
  - To propose a method to generate a national estimate of dual system youth, their trajectories leading to multiple system involvement, and the key characteristics/trajectories of this population.
    - *Led by Linked Administrative Data Subcommittee*
  - To identify the successes and challenges associated with cross-system collaboration and data integration in jurisdictions and design a method by which to collect and report such information in a consistent and representative way nationwide.
    - *Led by Jurisdictional Case Studies Subcommittee*

---

*This project was supported by Grant #2015-CV-BX-0001 awarded by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. The opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this publication/program/exhibition are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect those of the Department of Justice.*
Core Study Partners

Linked Administrative Data Subcommittee

Jurisdiction Case Study Subcommittee

Children's Law Center of Los Angeles
Chief Probation Officer, State of Florida
Los Angeles County Juvenile Court Judge

Juvenile Court Judge, Broward County Florida
Magistrate, Mahoning County, Ohio

Director, Maricopa County Education Service Agency
Defining Dual System Youth and their Trajectories
Categories of Crossover Youth

Non-Concurrent System Involvement

Crossover Youth
- Maltreated youth who engage in criminal activity but do not touch both systems

Dual System Youth
- Youth who touch both the child welfare and juvenile justice systems

Dual Contact Youth
- Youth who touch both systems but not at the same time

Concurrent System Involvement

Dually-Involved Youth
- Youth who touch both systems during the same timeframe

Dually Adjudicated Youth

Crossover Youth
Pathways to Dual System Involvement

Child Welfare Contact Precedes Juvenile Justice Contact

Juvenile Justice Contact Precedes Child Welfare Contact

Historical Child Welfare Case (Previously Open and Closed Prior to Concurrent System Involvement)
Assessing the Incidence of Dual System Youth and their Characteristics Using Linked Administrative Data
Linked Administrative Data Subcommittee
Key Research Partners for Site Data and Analysis

Cook County, Illinois: Chapin Hall Center for Children at the University of Chicago
• Robert Goerge, PhD, Senior Research Fellow
• Shannon Guiltinan, MPA, Researcher

Cuyahoga County, Ohio: The Center on Urban Poverty and Community Development (the Poverty Center) at Case Western Reserve University
• Claudia Coulton, PhD, Co-Director
• Youngmin Cho, PhD, Postdoctoral Scholar

New York City: The Center for Innovation through Data Intelligence in New York City
• Maryanne Schretzman, DSW, Executive Director
• Jessica Raithel, LMSW, MPH, Senior Analyst

Special thanks to the Courts, Probation Departments, and Child Welfare Agencies in Cook County, Cuyahoga County, and New York City without whom this study would not have been possible.
Methods Used for Analyzing Dually-Involved Youth

- Administrative data were obtained by the partners in the three jurisdictions
- Data was prepared and linked at the youth level across the CW and JJ data sources
- Research questions were developed that address the full range of possible pathways of dually-involved youth.
- Analyses were conducted using longitudinal descriptive statistics
COHORT OF YOUTH WITH 1st DELINQUENCY COURT PETITION

Cuyahoga County, OH (N=11,441)

CHILD WELFARE AND JUVENILE JUSTICE ADMINISTRATIVE DATA FROM 2010-2014 USED

New York City, NY (N=1,272)

CHILD WELFARE AND JUVENILE JUSTICE ADMINISTRATIVE DATA FROM 2013-2014 USED

Linking the Administrative Data Using a 1st JJ Petition Cohort
What is the Incidence of Dual System Youth across Sites?

Of the entire matched cohorts:
- 69% Cuyahoga Co.
- 70% NYC

Of all dual system youth:
- 49% Cuyahoga Co.
- 54% NYC

*Virtually all those in the dual contact category followed the child welfare pathway*

NOTE: 14% of Cuyahoga Co. cases could not be categorized
Los Angeles County Probation Study: Dual System Involvement among Probation Placement Exits

81% had previous contact with child welfare (Exits from Probation Group Home, N=250)

87% had previous contact with child welfare (Exits from Probation Corrections Placement, N=137)
What are the pathways that dually-involved youth take through the child welfare and juvenile justice systems?

Dually-Involved Youth

- Cuyahoga Co. (N=2,855)
- New York City (N=416)

- 3% Cuyahoga Co.
- 8% New York City

- 37% Cuyahoga Co.
- 17% New York City

- 55% Cuyahoga Co.
- 57% New York City

- 5% Cuyahoga Co.
- 18% New York City
What are the characteristics of dually-involved youth with a previous CW case v. dually-involved with no previous case?

**Male**
- African-American
- Average of 2 CW referrals
- First investigation at 7; last at 9
- Involved with CW on average for 14-24 mos.
- Up to 22% placed out of home—average of 3 placements
- About 1/3 detained after charge

**Male but females=30-50%**
- African-American
- Average of 2-3 CW referrals
- First investigation at 4; last at 16
- Involved with CW on average for 1-12 years
- 16-91% placement out of home—average of 5-9 placements
- 28-57% detained after charge
What are the characteristics of dually-involved youth with a previous CW case v. dually-involved with no previous case?

Dually-Involved Youth With A Previous CW Case

- Male but females=30-50%
- African-American
- Average of 3 CW referrals
- First investigation at 4; last at 9
- Involved with CW on average for 4-12 years
- 48-91% placement out of home—average of 5-9 placements
- 28-57% detained after charge

Dually-Involved Youth With No Previous CW

- Male but females=30%
- African-American
- Average of 2 CW referrals
- First investigation at 15; last at 16
- Involved with CW on average for 1-12 years
- 16-52% placement out of home—average of 4-5 placements
- 41-63% detained after charge
Jurisdictional Case Studies
Subcommittee
Development of the Best Practices Rubric
Overview of the JCS Work

JCS Goal: To identify the successes and challenges associated with cross-system collaboration and data integration in jurisdictions and design a method by which to collect and report such information in a consistent and representative way nationwide.

The Jurisdictional Case Study portion of the study:

1. Was separate from the Linked Administrative Data portion of the study (Did not include Cook County, Cuyahoga County or New York City)

2. Was limited to secondary data because time limitations and OMB requirements prevented the Subcommittee from collecting new data

3. Used secondary data collected as part of the Crossover Youth Practice Model developed by the Center for Juvenile Justice Reform, the Committee looked for the types of practices implemented by CYPM sites and the results they were reporting to generate a rubric of Promising/Best Practices for implementing integrated systems work for dual system youth.
How to Capture Systems Integration Work: Best Practices Rubric for Dual System Youth

Common Practices in Place To Support Dual System Youth:

1. Interagency collaboration
2. Judicial leadership
3. Information sharing
4. Data collection
5. Training
6. Identification of dual system youth
7. Assessment process
8. Case planning and management
9. Permanency, and transition plans
10. Placement planning
11. Service provision and tracking
**How to Capture Systems Integration Work: Best Practices Rubric for Dual System Youth**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judicial Leadership</th>
<th>Practice Not in Place</th>
<th>Initial Efforts in Place</th>
<th>Emerging Practice</th>
<th>Developed Practice</th>
<th>Highly Developed Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No judicial support or leadership. Or, there is active judicial opposition.</td>
<td>No active opposition. Some judicial support but not very involved nor leadership in the work.</td>
<td>Active judicial support for collaboration. Attends meetings but may not take a leadership role</td>
<td>Active judicial support. Regularly attends cross-system meetings and trainings; provides leadership but in a limited capacity</td>
<td>Active judicial support and leadership. Convenes and leads cross-system meetings, drives the work, and provides accountability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## How to Capture Systems Integration Work: Best Practices Rubric for Dual System Youth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Sharing</th>
<th>Practice Not in Place</th>
<th>Initial Efforts in Place</th>
<th>Emerging Practice</th>
<th>Developed Practice</th>
<th>Highly Developed Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is not a protocol in place and/or an MOU/MOA that supports or allows information sharing between CW and JJ systems.</td>
<td>An MOU/MOA or a protocol is in the process of being developed that allows information sharing between JJ and CW systems.</td>
<td>An MOU/MOA or a protocol is in place that allows information sharing between JJ and CW systems, but information is never exchanged or only shared under special circumstances (e.g., challenging case, emergencies, etc.).</td>
<td>An MOU/MOA or a protocol is in place that allows information sharing between JJ and CW systems, but information is not consistently shared.</td>
<td>An MOU/MOA or a protocol is in place that allows information sharing between JJ and CW systems and information is regularly shared between systems in a structured and collaborative manner.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential Practice Implications of the Rubric

- Apply to Random Sample of Jurisdictions
- Rankings Used to Produce a Continuum
- Identify Practices in High Performing Areas and Evaluate
- Empirically Identify Best Practices and Diffuse Nationwide
Where do we go from here?
The Trauma Perspective
## Trauma-Informed Systems...

- Routinely screen for trauma exposure and related symptoms (e.g., traumatic stress symptoms);
- Use evidence-based, culturally responsive assessment and treatment for traumatic stress and associated mental health symptoms;
- Make resources available to children, families, and providers on trauma exposure, its impact, and treatment;
- Engage in efforts to strengthen the resilience and protective factors of children and families impacted by and vulnerable to trauma;
- Address parent and caregiver trauma and its impact on the family system;
- Emphasize continuity of care and collaboration across child-service systems; and
- Maintain an environment of care for staff that addresses, minimizes, and treats secondary traumatic stress, and that increases staff wellness.
- Build meaningful partnerships that create mutuality among children, families, caregivers and professionals at an individual and organizational level; and
- Address the intersections of trauma with culture, history, race, gender, location and language, acknowledge the compounding impact of structural inequity, and are responsive to the unique needs of diverse communities.

National Child Traumatic Stress Network: www.nctsn.org
Where are the points for Trauma-Informed Intervention, Practices, and Services?

1. Juvenile Justice Contact
2. Placement Instability
3. Substance Use/Abuse
4. Need for Trauma Treatment
5. Child Welfare Involvement
6. Mental Health and Behavior Challenges
7. Child Welfare Contact
8. Complex Trauma Exposure
9. Dual Involvement
A need for a Trauma-Informed Approach to Dual System Youth
   - Trauma-Informed System Development is a Paradigm Shift that Relies on Organizational and Cultural Change
A need for Systems Integration and Cross System Collaborative Approaches
   - Within the Trauma-Informed Approach is a Systems Integration Approach for Dual System Youth
A need for Further Evaluation of These Approaches
   - Infrastructure to Support Evaluation
Contact Us

Denise Herz
dherz@calstatela.edu

Carly B. Dierkhising
cdierkh@calstatela.edu
Appendix A: CYPM Data Used

1. **CYPM Checklists**: Jurisdictions complete a checklist of practices implemented during the CYPM consultants’ involvement.

2. **Follow-Up SurveyMonkey Data**: CJJR conducted brief electronic surveys with sites regarding the practices they developed as part of CYPM and their successes and challenges of implementation.

3. **CYPM Data**: Participants in the CYPM are required to collect longitudinal data on the youth they identified as dually-involved over the course of the project. Characteristics are captured on these youth at the time they were identified as dually-involved and nine months later.

4. **Site Observations**: Attended CYPM meetings as observers with CYPM staff in 5 jurisdictions to listen to discussions related to successes and challenges in cross system work.

Although the CYPM data have their limitations, it provided insight into key characteristics or domains that should be reflected in integrated systems work for dual system youth and laid a basis for developing a rubric for larger data collection.