

Improving Outcomes for Dual Status Youth

BEYOND THE BENCH
DECEMBER 19TH, 2017

Presenters

*Honorable Carolyn M. Caietti, Juvenile Presiding
Judge of San Diego

*Kevin Gaines, California Department of Social
Services

*Jessica Heldman, Associate Executive Director,
Robert F. Kennedy National Resource Center for
Juvenile Justice

Session Roadmap

- ▶ California's Approach to Dual Status Youth
- ▶ Case Example
- ▶ Research, Data, and Best Practices from around the Nation
- ▶ On the Horizon for California (AB1911)
- ▶ San Diego's Example of Dual Status, CYPM
- ▶ Group Discussion of Challenges and Strategies

History of Dual Status in CA

4

- ▶ Prior to 2005, a child could not be both a dependent and ward of the court
 - ▶ What did that mean for children?
- ▶ In 2005, AB129 amended WIC to allow dual status youth
 - ▶ 18 counties, representing 67% of California's population, developed dual status protocols
 - ▶ There are several dual status models being used in the counties.
- ▶ 2015 audit by the state revealed flaws
 - ▶ Lack of standardized terms
 - ▶ Lack of defined outcomes
- ▶ The legislature responded with AB1911

Case in Point



- ▶ First CWS encounter at 5 months
- ▶ In delinquency at 13; terminated at 14
- ▶ Referred himself to CWS at 16; placed in several GHs over following year
- ▶ Incident at GH lead to disrupted placement and detention
- ▶ Jurisdictional foodfight ensues

Jurisdictional Foodfight Jeopardizes Future Support

- ▶ Clerical error left jurisdiction in question
- ▶ “Non-dual” county
- ▶ With multiple GH placements, difficulty in securing new placement following detention
- ▶ Result was 4 months in detention
- ▶ Recommendation from BOTH systems was detention until 18th birthday. . .
- ▶ Which would have rendered him ineligible for extended foster care

What could have been done differently



- ▶ Individual needs vs. family history
- ▶ Exploration of home-based care as a first option
- ▶ Continuum of Care Reform:
 - GH → Short Term Residential Treatment Program
 - Probation now required to develop home-based care as first placement option

Why Focus on Dual Status Youth?

- ▶ Coordination between systems leads to access to more treatment resources
- ▶ Poor communication and cultural differences lead to cross purposes

What do we know about dual status youth?

- ❑ Maltreated youth have increased risk for arrest as a juvenile and as adult (Widom and Maxfield, 2001)
- ❑ Prevalence
 - 67% of JJ youth had some form of CW involvement (King County, WA 2011); 83% of the cohort studied by the CDN had been referred to CPS at least once (Los Angeles, CA 2017)
 - 9%-29% of CW youth become involved with JJ (multi-city)
- ❑ Risk factors among youth in foster care (Cutuli, 2014)
 - Older age at first foster care placement
 - Experiencing a high number of placements
 - Placement in congregate care
 - Males and African-American youth in foster care are at greater risk of later juvenile justice involvement

What do we know about dual status youth?

- ❑ Outcomes and Experiences
 - Youth in foster care begin offending earlier, spend more time incarcerated, and commit a greater number of offenses than youth not in foster care. (Yang 2017)
 - Dual status youth have higher rates of recidivism (Lee & Villagrana, 2015)
 - Dual status youth are detained more often; and for longer periods of time. (Conger & Ross, 2001; Halemba & Siegel, 2011)
 - Dual status youth experience negative outcomes related to permanency, with significant numbers of placement changes and AWOL episodes. (Halemba & Siegel 2011)
 - Dual status youth are more likely than youth in just one system to experience a jail stay, lack of education and employment in young adulthood. (Center for Innovation through Data Intelligence, 2015)
- ❑ Protective Factors
 - Staying engaged with school
 - Having positive attachments/relationships
 - Engagement with non-delinquent peers

Recommended Practices

- ❑ Routine identification of dual status youth (San Diego)
- ❑ Individualized outcomes (El Dorado)
- ❑ Validated screening and assessment instruments
- ❑ Alternatives to formal processing at earliest opportunity and key decision points
- ❑ Engagement of families
- ❑ Joint assessment process across systems
- ❑ Coordinated:
 - ❑ case planning
 - ❑ court processes
 - ❑ case management (Santa Clara)
- ❑ Focus on family stability, placement stability, and community connections

AB1911

- ▶ Required Judicial Council to convene stakeholders
- ▶ Report approved by JC submitted to legislature
- ▶ Outcome tracking

- ▶ Recidivism Health Pregnancy
- ▶ Homelessness Employment Education

ADDITIONAL AREAS RECOMMENDED TRACKING:

- ▶ Substance abuse Placement stability
- ▶ Extended foster care participation
- ▶ Commercially sexual exploitation

Recommendations for Dual Status Youth (AB1911)

- ▶ Challenges related to tracking outcomes
 - ▶ No common definition of terms
 - ▶ No single way to identify same youth in various systems
 - ▶ No consistent data sharing and interface of networks
 - ▶ No consistent data collection
 - ▶ Systems needing updating
 - ▶ No consistent way to track youth, families who move to other counties

Identifying Terms

- ▶ Dual Status Youth
 - ▶ Youth simultaneously declared a dependent and a ward
- ▶ Child Welfare Crossover Youth
 - ▶ Youth whose child welfare case terminated in favor of wardship
- ▶ Juvenile Justice Crossover Youth
 - ▶ Youth whose juvenile justice case terminated in favor of child welfare finding
- ▶ Dually Involved Youth
 - ▶ Youth who is currently a child welfare or juvenile justice youth and has formal or informal action (pending or active) through child welfare, probation and/or the court
- ▶ Dually-Identified Youth
 - ▶ Youth with historical contact in one system and current contact with the other

Identifying Priority Outcomes to Track

- ▶ Runaway
- ▶ AWOL
- ▶ Voluntary Services
- ▶ Informal Services
- ▶ Informal Probation
- ▶ Child Welfare History
- ▶ Recidivism
- ▶ Child welfare re-entry,
- ▶ Child welfare re-detention
- ▶ Permanency
- ▶ Diversion
- ▶ Homelessness

Recommendations for Dual Status Youth (AB1911)

- ▶ What's the take away?
 - ▶ The purpose of AB1911 was to consider how we gather information about DSY and we share that information.
 - ▶ It represents a shift – a growing concern – with gathering the right information so we can better serve this population.

Dual Jurisdiction in California

- ▶ 18 Courts have dual protocols
 - ▶ <http://www.courts.ca.gov/7989.htm>
- ▶ Protocols vary
- ▶ Varies-lead, dual, on hold, combination of both
- ▶ Not all one judge, one court
- ▶ Eligibility varies
- ▶ Report, supervision duties vary
- ▶ Switching agency varies
- ▶ As AB1911 noted, no common tracking of data

Dual Jurisdiction in San Diego

- ▶ Began with dual protocol 1998, now CYPM 2012
 - ▶ Identify youth in one system touching another
 - ▶ Identify early on how to best handle, include CWS, Probation, Def Atty
 - ▶ Term probation at earliest possible time
 - ▶ Challenges with WIC707(b), camp
- ▶ One judge, one court
- ▶ Lead agency, court
- ▶ Dual unit in CWS and Probation
- ▶ Stakeholders meet monthly
 - ▶ On going work in progress, discuss issues
 - ▶ Original pushback on dual, concern over duplication service

Goals/Objectives

- ▶ Provide better and more coordinated services to crossover youth.
- ▶ Reduce number of youth in out-of-home placement.
- ▶ Reduce amount of arrests for assault in group homes.
- ▶ Reduce number of youth crossing over and becoming dually involved.
- ▶ Reduce length of detention

Goal/Objectives

- ▶ Develop stronger case plans earlier in the process; specifically at the first referral
- ▶ Strengthen family
- ▶ Improve case assessment, planning and management protocols.
- ▶ Create a cross system value around permanency, well-being and child and community safety.

Tracking Information

- ▶ Youth remain single/300, or dual, not single/602
 - ▶ 2016/17—78 youth had meet and confer
 - ▶ 54 remained single status dependents, 22 dual, 2 wards
- ▶ Fewer youth AWOL
- ▶ Fewer changes in placement
- ▶ Fewer re-offending
- ▶ Youth diverted from probation
 - ▶ 25% diverted, 25% not charged
- ▶ How many youth initially detained
 - ▶ If arrested, 50% detained initially

San Diego Data

2013-2016

- ▶ Total Youth 442
- ▶ Pre-Adjudication
 - ▶ Detained: 227
 - ▶ Not Detained: 207
- ▶ Juvenile Justice Outcome
 - ▶ Diverted 91
 - ▶ Not charged 124
- ▶ Average age: 15
- ▶ Gender
 - ▶ Male 249
 - ▶ Female 184
- ▶ Race
 - ▶ Asian 8
 - ▶ African American 151
 - ▶ Caucasian 96
 - ▶ Latino 168

22

Footer Text
12/15/2017

Challenges with DSY

- ▶ Communication with DSY stakeholders
 - ▶ Family, attorneys, education rights holder, CASA
- ▶ Access to information by CWS and Probation
 - ▶ Between the agencies
- ▶ Placement challenges
- ▶ Longer in detention facility pending placement?
- ▶ Cross county challenges
 - ▶ When one county is dual status, other county is single status
 - ▶ Last jurisdiction with petition usually isn't the county most familiar with the youth
- ▶ Meet and confer process WIC 241.1
 - ▶ Recent cases-reversals for not complying with WIC, CRC

DSY in Your Jurisdiction

- ▶ What challenges are you facing?

Thank you

- ▶ Hon. Carolyn M. Caietti, Presiding Judge of
Juvenile Court, San Diego
ccaietti@sdcourt.ca.gov
- ▶ Kevin Gaines, California Department of Social
Services
- ▶ Jessica Heldman, Associate Executive Director,
Robert F. Kennedy National Resource Center for
Juvenile Justice jheldman@rfkchildren.org